

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IMPROVEMENT OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION'S CAPACITY TO SERVE VETERANS WITH ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE

HON. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, February 19, I introduced four bills, H.R. 1101, 1102, 1103, and 1104, which, when passed, will help the Veterans' Administration better serve the growing population of veterans who need long-term care and, specifically, that large group of these veterans which suffers from Alzheimer's disease.

We have made some progress in recent years toward unraveling the mystery of Alzheimer's disease. The last Congress, in response to the concerns of many Members, appropriated additional moneys for research on the disease by the National Institutes of Health. More money has also been directed to the Veterans' Administration for such research. Although the scientific community could certainly profitably use additional funds to pursue a better understanding of the disease, we at least have the satisfaction of knowing that a meaningful research program has begun.

The four bills I introduced on February 19, Mr. Speaker, address a different aspect of the Alzheimer's problem, one which is more immediate and one on which we have not made a sufficient beginning; that is, the problem of treating and caring for people who today suffer from the disease.

ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE

Alzheimer's disease is one of the major afflictions which threaten old people, and it is certain to become more important as our population ages. It is the fourth leading cause of death among older persons, after heart attacks, cancer, and strokes. It will claim one in six of us in our later years unless the cause and a cure are found. Presently, 3 to 4 million Americans suffer from Alzheimer's disease, including tens of thousands of veterans. The illness runs from 3 to 20 years before the victim's inevitable death and is characterized by progressively debilitating memory loss, personality changes, and finally, total loss of control over bodily functions.

SIGNIFICANCE FOR THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

These statistics carry a grim significance for the Veterans' Administration. In 40 years, there will be 43 mil-

lion Americans 65 and over—almost double today's elderly population. This is the age group most vulnerable to Alzheimer's disease, although many in their forties and fifties become victims.

A large portion of this aging population is now, and will be later, veterans. Today, there are nearly 4 million veterans age 65 and over. By 1990, there will be almost twice that number—7.3 million. And in the year 2000, about two out of every three American males 65 and over will be veterans. A substantial portion of this veterans' population will suffer from Alzheimer's disease or related dementias. Clearly, the Veterans' Administration will have to assume a major responsibility for the care of these veterans.

NEED FOR CHANGES AT THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Unfortunately, the Veterans' Administration does not appear to be adequately prepared to deal with what will be a growing veterans' population in need of long-term care and, within that population, a substantial number of veterans with Alzheimer's disease. Under current law, first priority for admission into the Veterans' Administration health care system is given to those veterans with service-connected disabilities or conditions. Veterans with non-service-connected disabilities, including those with Alzheimer's, are admitted to "the extent that VA resources remain available," and if (1) they are 65 or over, or (2) they are indigent. This priority scheme is reasonable given that resources are now, and probably will remain, limited. Unfortunately, this priority scheme also can mean that some veterans with Alzheimer's or other chronic disabilities may not be accorded a high enough priority to receive care.

More importantly, the Veterans' Administration's ability to serve veterans with long-term care needs is hampered by several key features of its health care system.

LACK OF CONSISTENT POLICY AT THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

I shall return to this, the most important dimension of the problem, in a moment. Before I do, however, I want to stress that it is certainly not the case that the Veterans' Administration provides no care for Alzheimer's disease victims. In fact, I understand that some veterans with the disease are being treated—and treated well—in certain VA hospitals and nursing homes. However, taking the key features of the VA health care system as a given for the moment, it seems to be the case that there is no consistent VA

policy concerning veterans suffering from Alzheimer's disease.

In a series of hearings conducted by various House committees, including one I conducted in my own State of Maine, we have been told about experiences of families of Alzheimer's patients which highlight this lack of consistent policy. Apparently, some VA hospitals do accept Alzheimer's patients while others do not, with no obvious reasons for the differences in policy. We have also been told that some Alzheimer's patients who have been admitted to VA facilities have been asked to leave after only a short stay, or have been transferred to nursing homes where the families must bear the cost. Neither Medicare nor private insurance provide any significant amount of financial assistance to Alzheimer's victims. Under Medicaid, nursing home care is covered, but usually not until the patient's family has been reduced to poverty. The VA's failure to implement a consistent and fair admission policy for veterans with Alzheimer's disease only exacerbates the severe financial and emotional strains associated with this disease.

NEED FOR CHANGES IN KEY FEATURES OF THE VA'S HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

Inconsistencies such as this can probably be corrected. The most serious problem, to which I alluded above, is created by certain key features of the VA's health care system.

Once a veteran has been admitted into this system, with whatever degree of priority—service-connected or otherwise, care management continues throughout all varieties of care (acute and long term) and through all care settings (hospitals, nursing homes, adult day care centers, and so on) until discharge. While inside the system, that is, while on active status, a veteran may be referred to all levels and varieties of care.

Once discharged, however, non-service-connected veterans are outside the system on inactive status and the Veterans' Administration may not track them in any fashion. I understand, however, that the VA has already begun a computerized register of veterans on inactive status who have service-connected disabilities or conditions. Furthermore, once a veteran with a non-service-connected disability is discharged and enters inactive status, he or she must reapply for admission into the VA's health care system, competing with all other veterans seeking admission, including those with higher priority claims to service. Needless to say, these features of the system

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

greatly inhibit the Veterans' Administration's ability to keep track of what happens to non-service-connected veterans on inactive status, and also greatly hinders the VA's ability to provide necessary continuity of care, which is obviously very important, not to say essential, for individuals with chronic disability or recurring acute episodes.

FOUR BILLS DESIGNED TO ENABLE THE VA TO IMPROVE ITS SERVICES TO ALZHEIMER'S VICTIMS AND THEIR FAMILIES

The four bills I introduced on February 19 will help to establish the consistent policy the Veterans' Administration needs in order to effectively meet its obligations to veterans with Alzheimer's disease.

H.R. 1101 would provide the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration with the authority to provide treatment for Alzheimer's disease victims regardless of the age of the veteran. Such a grant of authority to the Administrator would permit the VA to respond to the needs of veterans who experience relatively early onset of the disease.

H.R. 1102 would require the Administrator to set aside 10 percent of the number of intermediate care hospital beds in Veterans' Administration medical facilities for the care of veterans suffering from Alzheimer's disease and related brain disorders. This requirement would replace uneven and capricious availability of care for Alzheimer's victims in VA facilities with more uniform and reliable care.

H.R. 1103 would direct the Administrator to submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report concerning treatment provided by the VA to veterans suffering from Alzheimer's disease and related organic brain disorders. This requirement will have the effect of focusing the VA's attention in a systematic way on the treatment it provides to veterans with Alzheimer's disease. It will have the added benefit of providing the Congress with systematic information about the VA's efforts in this area, thereby providing a basis for further administrative and legislative initiatives.

H.R. 1104 would provide an enrollment and tracking system in the VA which will help the agency coordinate the VA and community-based care for veterans who require long-term care. This bill would enable the VA to overcome the problems inherent in being unable to track veterans discharged from the Veterans' Administration care into inactive status. Essentially, the bill would create a new status in the VA health care system, that of enrollment. Under terms of this bill, any veteran who is furnished health or medical care by the VA would become enrolled in the VA health care system. Subsequently, a veteran may have

active or inactive status, but whichever obtains, the veteran remains enrolled. The practical import of enrolled status is twofold: First, the Veterans' Administration must track all enrollees, and second, any veteran who is enrolled shall be given priority for treatment over nonenrolled veterans unless that nonenrolled veteran is applying for care for a service-connected condition. This new status of enrollment would enable the VA to provide greatly improved continuity of care.

H.R. 1101

A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the improved treatment by the Veterans' Administration of veterans suffering from Alzheimer's disease and related organic brain disorders

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 610 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "or (f)" in subsection (a)(5) after "subsection (e)";

(2) by inserting "to a veteran to whom this subsection applies" in paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (e) after "may not be provided"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) In the case of a veteran suffering (or who may be suffering) from Alzheimer's disease or a related organic brain disorder, the Administrator may provide treatment for such disease under this chapter regardless of the age of the veteran."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 1985.

H.R. 1102

A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to set aside 10 percent of the intermediate-care hospital beds of the Veterans' Administration for the care of veterans suffering from Alzheimer's disease and related organic brain disorders

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 610 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(f) The Administrator shall provide that 10 percent of the number of intermediate-care hospital beds in Veterans' Administration medical facilities shall be set aside for the care of veterans suffering from Alzheimer's disease and related organic brain disorders."

H.R. 1103

A bill to direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to report to Congress on treatment by the Veterans' Administration of veterans suffering from Alzheimer's disease and related organic brain disorders

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives a report concerning treatment provided by the Veterans' Administration of veterans suffering from Alzheimer's disease and related organic brain disorders. The report shall include—

(1) a description of Veterans' Administration policy regarding the provision of information relating to such disease and related disorders, the diagnosis of such disease and related disorders in veterans eligible for health-care services under chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, and the provision of outpatient services, hospital care, and nursing home care for such disease and related disorders to such veterans;

(2) a description of any plans the Administrator has for the improvement of services relating to such disease and related disorders;

(3) recommended levels of funding for Veterans' Administration medical programs for the treatment of such disease and related disorders, shown for the fiscal year beginning after the fiscal year during which the report is submitted and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years; and

(4) any recommendations the Administrator may have for administrative or legislative action relating to the provision of services for such disease and related disorders.

H.R. 1104

A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the use by the Veterans' Administration health-care system of an enrollment system and for the use of a tracking system for the coordination of community-based care provided veterans requiring long-term care

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 602 the following section:

"§ 603. Enrollment and tracking system

"(a)(1) The Administrator shall maintain an enrollment system for veterans furnished health and medical care by the Veterans' Administration.

"(2) A veteran who is furnished health or medical care by the Veterans' Administration shall be enrolled in the Veterans' Administration health-care system. Once a veteran is enrolled, the veteran shall remain enrolled for so long as the veteran is eligible for health and medical care from the Veterans' Administration.

"(3) A veteran who is enrolled shall be carried in either an active status or an inactive status. When a veteran is admitted to the Veterans' Administration health-care system for the furnishing of medical and health care, the veteran shall be placed in an active status and shall continue in an active status for so long as treatment of the veteran continues. Upon discharge from treatment, the veteran shall be placed in an inactive status.

"(4) A veteran who is enrolled in the Veterans' Administration health-care system and is in an inactive status who applies to the Veterans' Administration for health or medical care shall be given priority in treatment over another veteran applying for care who is not already enrolled in the system unless the other veteran is applying for care for a service-connected condition.

"(b) The Administrator shall maintain a tracking system for veterans who are enrolled in the Veterans' Administration health-care system. The tracking system shall be used to follow and coordinate the provision of health-related services to veterans who require long-term care and receive care from entities other than the Veterans' Administration, including services from community-based organizations.

"(c) The Administrator shall prescribe regulations for the manner in which this section is to be carried out."

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 602 the following new item:

"603. Enrollment and tracking system."

SEC. 2. Section 603 of title 38, United States Code, as added by the first section of this Act, shall take effect on October 1, 1985.●

MISTREATMENT OF SOVIET JEWS

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that Soviet Jews remain trapped in a situation where it is difficult for them to practice their religion, a right which we so frequently take for granted, and yet they cannot leave the Soviet Union to emigrate to other lands where they may practice their religion freely. We pay tribute to their continuing courage and determination in the face of oppression.

The recent conviction of Aleksandr Kholmiansky, a Hebrew teacher from Moscow, on charges of "possessing ammunition" and "hooligan" activities is but one more example of the repression of the practice of their religion by Soviet Jews. In this case, however, the Soviets may well have a point. Mr. Kholmiansky did possess a form of ammunition—knowledge. He was undoubtedly guilty of using it. His activities as a teacher, the dissemination of knowledge about the history, teachings, and practice of Judaism, were undoubtedly as threatening to some as the use of weapons.

However, a religious idea is only dangerous when one chooses to fear it. Left alone, such ideas wither and die or flourish and enrich a society. Our Nation has certainly seen its share of religious ideas that have passed away. Those that have remained have been beneficial to all, not just the believers. It took our society quite a while to come to this understanding. Let us hope that the Soviet Government will soon come to the same conclusion. Until that time comes, however, it is important that we take every opportunity to stand in solidarity with those who suffer for their religious beliefs and practices.●

OUTLOOK FOR TAX REFORM

HON. DONALD J. PEASE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to include in the public record

the text of the speech given February 25 before the Economic Club of New York on the subject of the outlook for tax reform in the House Ways and Means Committee. It certainly is a welcome opportunity to hear the comments of Chairman DAN ROSTENKOWSKI—with his vast expertise in formulating tax policy—on this subject which is so closely tied to the national interest.

Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI correctly perceives the public's demand for reform and is taking a big step forward in ridding the Tax Code of numerous distortions built into it over the years.

In his speech, the chairman states,

The paradox presented by tax reform is that free enterprise has a substantial price—especially for business. Getting Government off your back, in the last analysis, means doing it yourself—whether it's selling airplanes abroad, salvaging a steel mill, or developing an advanced micro chip. That's a simple truth that some find painful, even those who cry loudest for freedom of choice. The alternative is continued Government intervention—and more layers of special exceptions, exemptions, transition rules, credits, and deductions that erratically guide economic decisions.

I am a strong supporter of efforts to broaden the tax base and to reduce individual and corporate income tax rates and am very pleased to submit this speech for the record. I hope that it will serve to focus the discussion by Members of the House on this critical subject.

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

Tax reform is a noble cause. Like anti-genocide treaties and flag day proclamations, everybody's for tax reform. But choosing the individual parts of a sweeping reform plan is no easier than grabbing quicksilver.

The question I put to you tonight is not so much whether we need tax reform, or want tax reform, but whether we can enact tax reform.

Some link tax reform with lower rates. Some fear it will end up costing them money. Others dread the fiscal uncertainty. To most, perfect tax reform is to have someone else's shelter torn down to pay for their tax cut.

Building a national consensus around tax reform—or more bluntly, twisting enough arms on the floor of the House and Senate—is a considerable challenge. Not just for Ronald Reagan or Bob Packwood or Dan Rostenkowski—but for all of us who worry that the inequities and inadequacies and excesses in the tax code will slow—and perhaps halt—the progress of recovery—like riding in a car with one soft tire.

Tax reform ought to be done. Tax reform can be done. All it takes is a lot of education, a lot of pushing and a lot of negotiating—all against the clock.

As the President put it: "If not us, who? If not now, when?"

So far, most tax reform proposals have been written in quiet, thoughtful chambers beyond the clamor of politics. Most are expansive and provocative, though at times they seem to complicate—rather than simplify. Parts of each plan defy administra-

tion. Others beg fights that shouldn't be fought—or can't be won. (But then, scholars and technicians tend to be far more courageous than politicians.) But, taken together, they contain most of the concepts that will guide us.

When Secretary Baker sits down before the Committee in two days, the campaign for massive reform will enter a new and more combative phase. From that moment on, tax reform moves from the cloisters into the coliseum.

Without question, the stakes are high. The Treasury plan would pick up an estimated 80 billion dollars by 1990 and move it to other columns. Some groups and industries would be forced to give up a substantial number of tax breaks. Others would gain enormously through rate cuts. But for most, the gain is a freer, simpler tax system.

In a more perfect world, we could all agree to a series of guiding principles—and then move quickly toward a balance that assures all parties long-term gains. But this is a free-wheeling democracy, not a perfect world.

So instead of gathering for a common cause, corporations, trade groups and unions have already begun to mass under battle flags. Extend the research and development credit. Save the investment tax credit. Head off the assault on capital gains treatment. Stop all taxes on fringe benefits.

Powerful coalitions are a reality in Washington—where campaign contributions, direct mail appeals and grass roots pressure have dramatically altered the "deliberative process." As the intramural competition for tax benefits intensifies, the code naturally becomes more convoluted as politicians seek to accommodate often contradictory interests.

To most, the words "tax reform" suggest a benign campaign for fairness and simplicity. But to a relative few, "tax reform" is a call to arms to protect lucrative tax breaks, no matter how unproductive, obsolete or excessive—or what's offered in trade. The last decade has provided ample evidence of a small number of people with a large amount at risk outflanking a larger number of people each with a small amount to gain.

The making of tax policy is always done with good intentions—stepping up capital formation, encouraging more public housing, promoting research and development. Often, tax policy is born of crisis: energy credits to cushion another embargo, safe harbor leasing to preserve basic industry, the all-savers certificate for teetering "S and Ls." The tax code reads like an American history book chronicling our uneven economic and social demands. Most were worthy in their time. Many are now outdated and unproductive—slicing cash from one sector to another with little concern for the ultimate economic consequence.

To those who are preparing to stand against change—I have a warning—don't underestimate the public demand for reform. Not just in think tanks and among liberal tax lawyers, but in the great belt of middle-income earners whose taxes are automatically withheld and sent off to Washington. Poll after poll reveals that far more than half the nation's taxpayers feel they're paying more than their fair share—that they're footing the bill left behind by those wealthy and facile enough to front-load deductions, defer income and turn ordinary income into capital gains. In essence, a few get to play pinball—the rest put up the quarters.

This growing bitterness hasn't escaped Ronald Reagan. He has bent it to his own political advantage for years. And now he's riding a new spirit of populism that suddenly puts him on the side of the poor and middle income taxpayer—at the expense of big business and big personal wealth—particularly those who pay an extremely low rate of tax. After all, it is not to big business or the wealthy that he owes his wide margin of victory—but to America's middle who so readily answer the call to protect traditional values like "fairness." Those who are gathering to derail tax reform should recall his knack for dividing complex issues into two simple parts—good and bad, fair and unfair, givers and takers—and asking, "Which side are you on?" It's not beyond the President to ask television viewers across the nation why the most powerful special interests should stand between the least powerful and tax cuts they long deserve? It's a devastating question that could unleash a potent backlash.

Taken one at a time, proposals to limit or eliminate tax expenditures would all be defeated. The only chance for tax reform is its promise for simplicity and rate reduction. If we give up that tension—that trade off—we are lost. Our success in the months to come will depend largely on four factors:

First, we need a visible and vocal presidential commitment. It isn't enough to recite tax reform's litany in the State of the Union address. He's got to bang the drum loudly—keeping pressure on interest groups and Congress alike.

Second, we can't make side deals that remove certain tax breaks from play. I understand the anxieties of labor leaders, governors, churches, business and others who stand to lose benefits under current reform proposals. But we can't rule out any change in the beginning—even the most popular and the least rational. We've got to start negotiations with everything on the table.

Third, we've got to begin the process where we're going to end—and that's in Congress. No ad hoc group, no matter how august or powerful, can replace the often rough and tumble legislative forum.

And fourth, if we're ever to reach a balanced reform plan, we've got to hew to a set of principles as we embark.

We ought to agree to revenue neutrality. If we raise a dollar in reform—then we owe that dollar back in rate reduction, whether for individuals or corporations. If budget cutting falters—and the deficit becomes a national dread—then revenue may have to be raised in the future. But that's the President's call—not ours.

We must not make the system less progressive—or more progressive. That means maintaining the proportional share that each income class in our society pays. This is no time to shift the burden upward or downward.

We've got to pay for income tax cuts with income tax increases. This must be a zero sum game. To pay for income tax cuts with the proceeds of another form of tax discounts, the dollar-for-dollar tradeoff between tax reform and tax cuts.

The paradox presented by tax reform is that free enterprise has a substantial price—especially for business. Getting government off your back, in the last analysis, means doing it yourself—whether it's selling airplanes abroad, salvaging a steel mill or developing an advanced micro chip. That's a simple truth that some find painful—even those who cry loudest for intervention—and more layers of special exceptions, exemp-

tions, transition rules, credits and deductions that erratically guide economic decisions.

We can't have it both ways. We can't ask government to get off our backs—and still extend a helping hand whenever times get a bit difficult. Nor can we expect tax cuts without paying the price of reform.

The price of reform must be affordable. No one sector should be crippled by the elimination of present breaks. No person should be penalized tomorrow for doing something that's perfectly permissible today.

The transition from the old code to the new code must be without abrupt and arbitrary changes. Transition rules will be a major concern in drafting.

The price of tax reform should also include a reprieve from massive, annual shifts in taxation. Business has good reason to gripe about continued uncertainty. As chairman, I hate to lead the Committee back into a section of the code that we just finished rebuilding the last time around. Tax reform can't be a game with endless overtimes. If we successfully conclude a major tax overhaul this Congress, I would be the first to oppose any further significant restructuring for the foreseeable future.

Tax reform must be a bipartisan mission. We can't have one side promising tax cuts and the other side left to raise the money to pay for them. In the end, the measure of success will not be the weight of reform—but the balance of votes.

While tax reform will be one of the central focuses of the Ways and Means Committee in the coming days and weeks, we cannot lose sight of the urgent need to reduce the budget deficit and eliminate one of the most serious threats to our medium and long-term economic health. By the end of 1984, federal debt was equal to nearly 40 percent of our gross national product, and that figure could climb to 50 percent by the end of the decade if we don't take steps immediately to reduce the budget deficit. Already we see that the cost of servicing our burgeoning debt is the fastest growing component of the budget.

This means that as the federal government takes an increasing share of the private savings generated here at home, we must import capital from abroad to satisfy the growing credit demands of business and government. Last year, the capital sent here by foreigners was enough to finance about half the federal budget deficit.

Clearly we need that capital to avoid even higher interest rates and a damper on economic growth. But this situation cannot continue indefinitely, and it already is harming some important sectors of our economy—primarily those sectors that must export or compete with imports. The enormous inflows of foreign capital to the United States are keeping the dollar at astronomical levels. While the budget deficit is not the only reason for a strong dollar—the strong U.S. economy and this country's political stability also are important factors—the budget deficit is the one factor which we can alter.

Our trade deficit has doubled in size for each of the past three years: last year it reached an unprecedented \$123 billion. Most analysts—including the Reagan Administration—blame the strong dollar for most of this drain. In essence, economic recovery is bypassing our trading sector, with serious implications for the future. If we fail to reduce the budget deficit, and thereby help bring the dollar to more reasonable

levels, we will be ensuring the steady erosion of our manufacturing base as firms realize they must build plants overseas to escape the disastrous effects of a strong dollar on their international competitiveness. In short, the federal government can't go on running up its current spending on our exporters' tab.

Gathered in this room tonight is the force for reform. To most of us, tax reform and deficit reduction are just causes. It makes sense to simplify the code and lower tax rates. Despite public testimony from business groups, few decisions in your world hang on any one provision in the tax code. For all the promise of the 1981 investment incentives, their impact is not clear. Clearly, certain industries—like real estate development—benefited greatly (just measure the overhang of unused office space in Houston.) But given the cost, the complexity and the bias—is more better than less? Or should we all begin the long task of rethinking and rebalancing federal tax incentives?

If you agree with me that everyone must pay a certain price for reform, then you must also accept my invitation to work with us in Congress—not against us. Too often I talk to heads of businesses who declare their support for reform—only to be attacked by their Washington lobby pursuing the firm's special interest with a vengeance. Too often, the falconer never talks to his falcon. The cost? Confusion, ill will and delay.

We only get a chance at profound reform every decade or so. Our Republican president seems prepared to back the struggle—if not lead the charge. Secretary Baker seems ready to ride. Congressional leaders—while rarely enthusiastic about projects which demand such painful choices—appear ready for (or resigned to) the long march. Taxpayers are slowly, but surely, warming to the rewards of reform. (And woe unto the politician who disappoints them.)

But without you—leaders in the corporate and financial world—the prospect for success is very tentative. If you can see beyond the battle flags of your own special interests, if you can reason beyond the hysteria of the moment, I am convinced that tax reform and tax freedom is within our grasp. It may be the last chance we all have for a long time. ●

THE INDIGNATION INDUSTRY

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was struck by the clarity and truthfulness of the recent article by George F. Will that appeared in the Washington Post on Thursday, February 21, 1985. Mr. Will points out much better than I the obvious inconsistency followed by the president of the University of the Pacific. It appears that Mr. Stanley McCaffrey, while talking platitudes about academic freedom and opportunity in the field of higher education, at the same time denies the new Secretary of Education the opportunity to speak at this institution.

This inconsistency and hypocrisy have not gone unnoticed in the Halls

of Congress, and I recommend to all my colleagues the following column.

THE INDIGNATION INDUSTRY
(By George F. Will)

Stanley McCaffrey, a cop in the ranks of the thought police, saw his duty and did not flinch. McCaffrey, president of California's University of the Pacific, saw what William Bennett said and withdrew an invitation for Bennett to receive an honorary degree: "We simply cannot honor a person holding these views."

I know little about the University of the Pacific, but I will wager that it resembles most universities and therefore is broad-minded about the expression, and even the teaching, of the view that America is racist, sexist, imperialist, militarist, etc. So what did Bennett, the new secretary of education, say that caused McCaffrey to recoil and become the toast of the faculty club?

Among other things, Bennett said that, for budgetary reasons, subsidies to middle-class students should be cut. Specifically, families with incomes above \$32,500 should not be eligible for federally guaranteed loans (that would mean they would have to pay perhaps 12 rather than 8 percent interest).

There are many Americans—including, I suspect, McCaffrey—in whom the flame of thought flickers so weakly that they only feel vital and engaged with history when they are indignant. America's indignation industry makes neither shoes nor butter nor poetry. Rather, it makes mandatory blandness by practicing moral intimidation. Its intimidation works on people who can be intimidated by the denial of the honor, such as it is, of a degree from the hands of the likes of McCaffrey.

Blandness in public utterance is encouraged by television journalism, which, because of the tyranny of the clock, specializes in what are known as "sound bites." It defines, and distorts, individuals with brief, telegraphic "bites." A nation that knew nothing of Secretary Bennett got its first glimpse of him in "a sound bite." He was saying that for some students the cut in subsidies might mean having to forgo a stereo or car or spring vacation at the beach.

A typical viewer probably got this glimpse on television at dinner time. The baby was crying and so was the Cuisinart, the phone was ringing and so was the viewer's head because Billy, 14, had his cassette player blasting out Madonna's "Like a Virgin." It was all background music for the 15-second sound bite that introduced Bennett to the nation.

Sound bites are more than adequate to present all the thoughts of some people. But Bennett is not one of them. He is the only member of the Cabinet who has spent his life taking serious ideas seriously. That is what makes him dangerous to the academic division of the indignation industry.

Bennett says that there can be no "right" for every student to attend the university of his or her choice. Anyone who disagrees with that has a peculiar understanding of the allocation of public goods, especially goods such as university admissions that are valued in part because of the various forms of status they can confer.

Bennett says (well, he said it once, he probably will not say it again because departures from blandness cause too much turmoil) this: He can imagine not being dismayed if his son someday wants the money saved for university tuition to be used instead to start a business.

Bennett is not expressing a Philistine preference for money over mind; he is expressing dismay that so many universities serve the mind poorly. This point, which he has been making forcefully for three years as head of the National Endowment for the Humanities, has been missed by persons eager to strike a pose of indignation. Which brings us back to McCaffrey, who has disinvited Bennett. Why? "Because I find your views to be directly contrary to those held by me and our University of the Pacific."

The aid plan Bennett defends will preserve all aid for the least affluent students who, without aid, could not go to any college. It would make less-expensive public institutions better able to compete with private institutions, such as the University of the Pacific, for middle-class students. The aid plan is debatable. But dishonorable?

The hysterical condemnation of Bennett illustrates the moral exhibitionism of people like McCaffrey. It also reveals that the academic lobby—like, say, the tobacco lobby, but with more moral pretenses—has become an organized appetite. Bennett has interrupted its concentration on the social pork barrel by raising disturbing questions about academic purposes and competence.

McCaffrey's approach to controversy is not new. "Why should we bother to reply to Kautsky?" Lenin asked. "He would reply to us, and we would have to reply to his reply. There's no end to that. It will be quite enough for us to announce that Kautsky is a traitor to the working class, and everyone will understand everything." McCaffrey should know that everyone understands him. ●

THE JOB CORPS: A WORTHY
PROGRAM

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring attention to the plight of the Job Corps, which is under attack from the Reagan administration.

The Job Corps has been one of the most cost effective Great Society programs. It has trained tens of thousands of disadvantaged young people in useful job skills. In this age when the poor and minorities need training more than ever before, we should be lending a hand for their benefit.

I would like to submit the following New York Times editorial for the use of my colleagues. It presents an excellent view of the administration's attempts to gut this fine program.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 26, 1985]

KEEP THE JOB CORPS: IT WORKS

The Reagan Administration is a relentless critic of Great Society programs that don't work. Why, then, is it so eager to eliminate the Job Corps, which does?

The Administration says programs created under the Job Training Partnership Act, enacted in 1982, serve the same disadvantaged groups as the Job Corps, but far more efficiently and at substantially lower cost. There's only one problem with this claim: It can't be proven and actually appears to be false.

The Labor Department so far has issued data on the first nine months of Partnership Act programs, ending last June 30. They show "positive terminations"—jobs, additional schooling or military enlistments—for 63 percent of the 153,400 young people who passed through the programs during that time. The average cost was \$3,287.

By comparison, the Job Corps' numbers seem unimpressive. Only 35 percent of those who enroll in the corps complete a training program, although three-fourths of these graduates have "positive terminations." And the average annual cost for each of the corps' 40,500 training slots is almost \$15,000.

But the disparity in success rates seems to reflect less what takes place in the programs than what they start out with. Not every disadvantaged person is equally disadvantaged. And independent studies suggest that most of the young people in the Job Training Partnership programs could not be called hard-core.

The Job Corps, however, has a well-documented 20-year record of taking the toughest cases, youngster already well down the road to perpetual joblessness, dependency or criminality. A recent study found only 15 percent had high school diplomas; 38 percent had arrest records. In such cases, the investment must necessarily be greater. But for each success, the payoff—both for the individual and society—also is greater.

Senator Orrin G. Hatch of Utah, a Republican and a conservative, understands this and is leading the fight in Congress to save the Job Corps. That fight should not even be necessary. And it wouldn't be, if the Administration would appreciate the value of things as well as their price. ●

PUBLICATION OF "SILENT
SPRING"

HON. DONALD J. PEASE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, in 1962, the publication of "Silent Spring" by Rachel Carson gave rise to new concern for our natural environment. Now it is time to add a new dimension to that concern by banning the importation of the cancer-causing chemical benzidine into the United States.

Benzidine and its derivatives continue to be produced and used in many parts of the world, despite overwhelming scientific evidence that this chemical is a deadly carcinogen. Some industrialized nations, including the United States, have acted to limit the exposure of their own workers to benzidine. But thousands of workers, especially those in many Third World countries, are being exposed to this cancer-causing agent because they are completely unaware of the danger or they are powerless to do anything about it. That is why I have introduced legislation, along with Congressmen OBEY, BONIOR, and FLORIO, to counteract what amounts to a slow motion, Bhopal-type health hazard that

threatens the lives of many unsuspecting people.

My bill—the Benzidine Protection and Control Act of 1985—has three purposes:

First, to encourage the world community to take immediate steps to end all worker exposure to benzidine and benzidine-based products;

Second, to protect workers exposed to benzidine and benzidine-based products; and

Third, to prohibit the importation of benzidine and benzidine-based products into the United States.

For more than 75 years, a growing volume of scientific evidence has been compiled to substantiate that benzidine and its derivatives should be regarded as strong human carcinogens. The cancer-causing effect is further confirmed by animal data and supported by studies on bacteria and mammalian cells, as well as by in vivo and in vitro data on the DNA-binding and DNA-damaging capacity of benzidine.

In the United States, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration [OSHA] enforces regulations designed to hold worker exposure to benzidine to the lowest feasible amount. In addition, OSHA and the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health [NIOSH] in 1980 issued a health hazard alert, warning of the danger of exposure to benzidine-based dyes. That was followed in 1983 with a NIOSH report on steps to be taken to limit exposure to benzidine-based dyes. On an international level, the International Agency for Research on Cancer in 1982 published a monograph on the carcinogenic risks associated with exposure to certain benzidine-based dyes.

Why single out benzidine for an import ban? First, it is a well-identified carcinogen for which there are readily available, inexpensive alternatives. An import ban would have virtually no effect on U.S. industry since there are domestically manufactured substitutes for benzidine already in widespread use. Second, it would discourage the shifting of production of this deadly chemical from developed to less-developed countries.

Enactment of this bill would demonstrate our country's willingness to renounce continued trade in a chemical known to bring immense suffering and death to workers exposed to it. At the same time, we can step up the pressure for an international compact to discourage any production and commerce in benzidine—a necessary first step in protecting workers throughout the world from carcinogens.●

LACK OF WISDOM IN DEFENSE SPENDING

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, perhaps no single issue has captured the attention of the Congress, the President, the media, or the public more than the ever-growing U.S. defense expenditures relative to national security commitments. Americans have historically favored a strong national defense at home and reliable commitments to our own interest, as well as our allies' interests, abroad. However, it has become increasingly clear that many Americans are somewhat skeptical and concerned as to the effectiveness, rationality, and, most importantly, the costs, which are stemming from such defense policies and objectives.

Consequently, I would like to commend to my colleagues the remarks of Mr. Bill Moyers, as broadcast on January 16, 1985, on the CBS television network news. What Mr. Moyers offers in regard to analyzing American defense budgetary commitments is not only logical, it is practical, feasible, and, most importantly, necessary to understand and control, our spiraling defense expenditures and national security commitments.

I hope that the recommendations offered below will be carefully considered during the upcoming budget deliberations.

The remarks follow:

CBS MORNING NEWS

(As broadcast over the CBS Television Network, January 16, 1985, with CBS news correspondents Bill Kurtis and Phyllis George.)

KURTIS: In this pre-inauguration week, Bill Moyers is sharing his thoughts with us on some of the challenges that face the nation, and today the subject is defense. So often the defense question is one of weaponry. Do we need an MX? How many American subs against how many Soviet subs? Where do we put our cruise missiles? Do we need a new generation of bombers to launch them? But Bill Moyers says there's an entirely different way of looking at defense.

BILL MOYERS: Bill, the beginning of wisdom is to become clear about our situation. I wish I'd said that first, but I didn't. The author of this little pamphlet said it. His name is Earl Ravenal. He's a scholar, former official of the Pentagon and a key man at the Cato Institute in Washington. That's a libertarian research foundation which asks questions conventional politicians can't.

Sometimes the answers are slipped over the public transom to plop unexpectedly into the general conversation, and I think that'll be true of Mr. Ravenal's ideas. Whether you agree with him or not, you'll see the coming debate on defense spending in a different light if at least you entertain his analysis. There's no fog around his opinions, and the clarity of his language would please George Orwell. You'll recall that Orwell believed, "Whoever writes English is

involved in a struggle that never lets up for a sentence. He's struggling against vagueness, against obscurity, against the worn-out phrases and dead metaphors with which the language is cluttered up."

No clutter here. Ravenal takes just 46 pages to argue a basic reappraisal of America's role in the world. Defense budgets, he says, are not for nothing. They're for something. The dollars buy forces, the forces have missions, the missions are in regions where the United States has defensive commitments or supposed strategic interests. These, in sum, are practically equivalent to the nation's foreign policy, and they're expensive. Consider the Nimitz-class nuclear carrier. The carrier and its battle group are servants of our foreign policy, the means we project our power to distant shores and seas. Ravenal reckons the lifetime costs for one of the battle groups to be approximately \$400 billion over 30 years. Four hundred billion, he says, to increase our greatness as a nation by the capability to wage 35 attack sorties a day, or to be fair, to patrol a few of the world's sea lanes.

This ratio between cost and pay off leads him to ask if our foreign policy isn't being priced out of reach, and to conclude that large cuts in the defense budget can be made only if there is a significant change in foreign policy. You don't need all the carrier groups if you don't attempt all the missions. But you can't retain the same foreign policies, and simply trim the means to carry them out. The so-called defense reform won't save much money, the idea that leaner is tougher, or eliminating waste, fraud and mismanagement, or killing this or that weapon.

These, he says, are at best transient savings. Solvency, our ability to do what we're obliged to do in full faith and credit, requires something more, including being honest with ourselves. Ravenal thinks we have reached the predicament, through a long string of Administrations Democratic and Republican, of living beyond our means. But our ambitions somehow have to be paid for, and they will be—through higher taxes or further cuts in domestic programs, or printing money, or borrowing in the ordinary credit markets. Any of these can be costly in other ways, including the frayed quality of private and public life.

Or, says Ravenal, we can find a foreign policy, a national strategy, appropriate to our economy, appropriate to our liberties, and appropriate to the character of American society. This will mean hard choices about what we want to do in the world, the alliances we make, the adversaries we challenge. His own bias is to reduce our defensive commitments and design a nuclear program to protect a far smaller perimeter shielding our core values. We should not just draw lines in the sand, he says. We'll always need a strategy that discourages direct nuclear attacks or the threat of nuclear blackmail. But enough is enough, says Earl Ravenal. An extensive, engaged foreign policy and a large active military require big, intrusive demanding government, the kind, he reminds us, that President Reagan told us in the first inaugural address is the problem.

There's no free lunch and no free lease on the world. That's the trouble with dangerous ideas in little books. They first make you uncomfortable, then they make you think.●

SCIENCE TALENT SEARCH

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the Science Service recently announced the names of 300 outstanding young American men and women who have been chosen to receive honors in the annual Westinghouse Science Talent Search. Established in 1941, the Science Talent Search was founded to identify and honor high school seniors who demonstrate the potential to become promising research scientists and engineers of the future.

I am proud to note in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today that two young people from my congressional district were selected by the Science Service to receive honors among this prestigious group of students. Ms. Peggy Delinois, a student at the Bronx High School of Science and a resident of the Brooklyn College area, was honored for her research project "Search for the Relationship Between the Location of Fibronectin and of Platelets in Narrow Spaces." Mr. Michael Alleyne Baird, a student at Prospect Heights High School and a resident of the Prospect-Lefferts Gardens neighborhood, was honored for his research project "Coenzyme Q Is Linked to a Peptide: Purification and Characterization."

It is with great pleasure that I join the family, friends, and teachers of these young people in congratulating them for their early scholarly distinction. For both their present achievements and the many valuable contributions sure to come, Ms. Delinois and Mr. Baird are a source of great pride for our entire community. ●

DUCKING THE WORLD COURT

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an excellent oped piece which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on February 22, 1985, concerning the World Court controversy.

The author is Richard Gardner, professor of law and international organization at Columbia University, a former U.S. Ambassador to Italy and Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. Mr. Gardner makes two points which are key to the issue.

First, that by refusing to accept the jurisdiction of the World Court in this instance, a jurisdiction which we had sought and accepted in the past, the

United States has undermined the World Court as a "useful vehicle for developing sensible rules of international behavior."

Second, that the reputation of the United States as a law-abiding nation has been seriously damaged.

I enter this into the RECORD in the hope that the United States may attempt to undo this damage in any future instances involving the World Court and might learn from it in our current dealings in Central America.

IT WAS WRONG TO DUCK THE WORLD COURT

(By Richard N. Gardner)

"Realists" as well as "jurisprudes" have reason to question the Reagan administration's refusal to participate further in the case Nicaragua has brought against us in the International Court of Justice. Our national security is best served by strengthening, not weakening, those few international institutions that can promote stability and order in international relations.

Walking out of a proceeding before an international tribunal that finds it has valid jurisdiction over us is also profoundly un-American behavior. Our founding fathers and leading statesmen throughout our history have believed the U.S. has had moral as well as practical reasons for advancing the rule of law among nations.

In 1946, with the overwhelming support of both political parties, including such conservative Republicans as Arthur Vandenberg and John Foster Dulles, we accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court. Since then, every Republican and Democratic administration until this one has seen a strengthened World Court as a useful vehicle for developing sensible rules of international behavior.

The "covert" aid to the Nicaraguan insurgents that the Reagan administration began in 1981 was a questionable operation on both legal and practical grounds. Having started down this road, however, the administration might have limited its international liability by terminating our acceptance of the World Court's compulsory jurisdiction or adding a reservation to it for cases involving armed conflict or national security. Whether by design or by inadvertence, it failed to do so.

It was thus in the awkward position of filing a modification of our acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction just three days before Nicaragua brought its case against us last spring. It did this in the face of a requirement of six months' notice, which the Senate approved in 1946 in order, as it said, to ensure that we would not change the nature of our obligation "in the face of a threatened legal proceeding."

The U.S. did raise some legally significant objections to the court's jurisdiction. But the fact is that every one of the court's judges except the American judge found some basis for jurisdiction. Among them were distinguished jurists from Britain, West Germany, France, Italy, Japan, Brazil and Argentina, none of whom can by any stretch of the imagination be regarded as politically biased against us.

It is therefore both unconvincing and unfortunate for the administration to impugn the integrity of the court by charging that it was "determined to find in favor of Nicaragua" and that it is in danger of becoming "more and more politicized against the interests of the Western democracies." While the political independence of some of the

court's judges is open to question, the court's composition is essentially the same today as it was in 1962 and 1980 when our country successfully invoked its support in the peacekeeping-expenses dispute with the Soviet Union and the hostage case with Iran.

Nor is it convincing for the administration to argue that the court overstepped its powers because our controversy with Nicaragua is "political," involves armed conflict, and touches the inherent right of self-defense. Article 33 of the United Nations Charter clearly specifies that the court may deal with the legal aspects of political controversies, as it did in the hostage and peacekeeping-expenses case. The U.S. has brought seven cases before the court involving armed attacks on American military aircraft. And our country has repeatedly and properly argued that national claims of self-defense raise issues of international law that can be reviewed by international bodies.

If we have a really convincing factual and legal basis for our support of the Nicaraguan insurgents on the ground of collective self-defense, as the administration believes, we should have been prepared to present it to the court, and our failure to do so cannot be justified on the ground that our evidence is "of a highly sensitive intelligence character." We did, after all, show satellite photographs of Soviet missile sites to the Security Council in 1962 when it was necessary to mobilize world support for the Cuban quarantine.

In short, we should have proceeded to argue the merits of our case, joined by El Salvador and Honduras, which have the right to intervene now and be heard, as the court itself has confirmed. The factual and legal complexities would have been so great as to delay a final court judgment for many months, perhaps a year or more. We could have used that time to negotiate through the Contadora process an end to both our intervention in Nicaragua and Nicaragua's intervention in El Salvador and Honduras.

The administration's walkout from the court signals, instead, a determination to continue our support for the Nicaraguan insurgents despite the formidable legal and political consequences. In the process we will have undermined both the World Court and the reputation of the U.S. as a lawabiding nation. ●

NO MORE FUNDING FOR THE ANIMAL WELFARE ACT

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention and to the attention of my colleagues the Reagan fiscal year 1986 budget proposal to eliminate funds for the enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act. This is the fifth year that the Reagan administration has proposed to cut this program; this is the fifth time Congress will be called upon to restore these funds.

Mr. Speaker, the original Animal Welfare Act was passed in 1966 by a vote of 352 to 10 in the House and 85

to 0 in the Senate and strengthened in 1970 and 1976. This law was developed out of strong sentiment that animals should not be subjected to unnecessary pain or suffering. It enjoys the strong support of the American public. The act sets standards for humane care and treatment of certain warm-blooded animals used for biomedical research, exhibition purposes or sale through pet stores. Standards cover housing, sanitation, shelter, ventilation, feeding, watering, veterinary care, transportation, and separation of incompatible animals.

Last September, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Department Operations, Research and Foreign Agriculture, I held hearings on H.R. 5725, the Improved Standards for Laboratory Animal Act. This legislation would again strengthen the Animal Welfare Act. The message from all nonadministration witnesses was the clear: The Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service's [APHIS] enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act could be improved. Members of both the science community and the animal welfare community agreed that APHIS should receive more funds for this program, and that APHIS inspectors should receive more training, not less training.

While the Animal Welfare Act currently restricts cock and dog fighting, the sale of stolen dogs and cats to research facilities, and inhumane handling and care of animals, these events still occur. In fiscal year 1984, APHIS reported 200 alleged violations of the Animal Welfare Act. Of these incidents, there were 23 prosecuted, 5 dismissals, 26 civil penalties, and 8 license suspensions. In a February 19, 1985, press statement, APHIS reported settling eight cases of violations of the Animal Welfare Act in January.

APHIS also inspects research facilities with regard to animal care and housing. In testimony at the September hearings, an analysis of recent APHIS inspection reports gained from freedom of information requests was presented. The report noted that APHIS had found deficiencies in several laboratories throughout our country. While many of the deficiencies were corrected, they may not have been without the APHIS inspections. There is no reason to believe that violations of the Animal Welfare Act will stop if the enforcement program is eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, Members of this House are well aware of the growing public concern regarding animal care. Groups concerned about animal welfare are springing up around the country, with close to 2,000 humane societies in the United States, and membership in these organizations is increasing. The recent article regarding animals in *Parade* magazine, titled "Should They Have Rights"? received more mail than any other article run by *Parade*.

It is quite clear that a large portion of Americans feel strongly that the animal care laws are important and should be enforced. Eliminating funding for the enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act would make the law moot. Stopping enforcement of a law which has been on the books for close to 20 years, and one which has the support of a large sector of society, is an affront to our legislative system.

I recognize the need for fiscal restraint, but the elimination of these funds, only \$4.8 million, will hardly make a dent in our national deficit. On the other hand, elimination of these funds would take our country a large step backward in insuring humane treatment of animals.

As one woman put it: "David Stockman has finally done the unthinkable. He has kicked the family dog."

Mr. Speaker, how much longer must we put up with this?

NEIGHBORHOOD WATCH PROGRAM

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which could provide valuable communications assistance to our Nation's neighborhood watch and crime watch programs. Neighborhood watch programs involve members of the community in patrolling their own neighborhoods and reporting crimes or other unusual behavior.

This legislation directs the Federal Communications Commission [FCC] to review the feasibility of establishing a CB station for these crime prevention groups and issue recommendations within 1 year.

In conducting this study, the Federal Communications Commission would examine four important areas:

First, it would examine the benefits of assigning channel 11 for the exclusive use by neighborhood watch programs.

Second, it would address its effective use in densely populated areas which may have several neighborhood watch programs.

Third, it would review the current ability of neighborhood watch programs to use the general use channels, including the emergency frequency, channel 9.

Finally, it would review the adequacy of the present emergency channel, channel 9, if channel 11 is not established for exclusive use by these groups.

Since the inception of these crime-prevention groups, their ability to communicate effectively with each other and law enforcement agencies

has been restricted. I believe the passage of this legislation would allow neighborhood watch groups to perform their duties more effectively, while at the same time use the CB communications system to its fullest extent. Research and statistics show that neighborhood watch groups have proven to be a positive crime deterrent. I want to enhance this valuable crime prevention program by improving the communications network. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

H.R. 1327

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall conduct, and take final action in, a proceeding for the assignment of a particular channel in the citizen band radio service for use by neighborhood watch programs.

(b) In conducting the proceeding under this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall consider—

(1) the benefits of assigning the frequency of 27.085 megahertz (channel 11) for the exclusive use of neighborhood watch programs and the likely extent of such use, both in the short-term and the long-term;

(2) any administrative problems which may arise, including enforcing the exclusivity of its use;

(3) the monitoring of the channel by State and local law enforcement agencies, including means to facilitate such monitoring;

(4) means of ensuring its effective use in densely populated areas with numerous neighborhood watch programs;

(5) the extent of use of the general use channels (including the emergency and traveler assistance channel, channel 9) and their capacity to be used on a regular basis for neighborhood watch programs;

(6) the adequacy of the existing emergency communication channel (channel 9) for emergency and traveler assistance if channel 11 is not assigned for such programs; and

(7) such other matters as it considers appropriate.

(c) The Federal Communications Commission shall provide opportunity for public comment in the proceeding under this Act.

Sec. 2. As used in this Act, the term "neighborhood watch program" means a crime prevention program—

(1) which is established for the purpose of assisting in the reporting to law enforcement officers of suspicious persons or circumstances in urban, suburban, and rural residential areas; and

(2) which is established by or affiliated with a State or local law enforcement agency.●

RELEVANT FACTS FOR DAVID STOCKMAN

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to read the fol-

lowing editorial by Bob Bishop in the February 16, 1985, edition of the *Nebraska Farmer*. He explains why the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, David Stockman, is wrong, wrong, wrong in some of his views about American agriculture and the responsibilities of the U.S. Government in assisting our farm, ranch, and agribusiness families:

RELEVANT FACTS FOR DAVID STOCKMAN

Budget Director David Stockman obviously has a rough job. One of the roughest in government. In a city of spenders, being one of the few defenders of a balanced budget has to make him one of the loneliest men in town. Obviously, he's tough, talented and smart.

That's why it comes as no surprise to hear Stockman lambast agriculture the way he has in recent days. What is surprising is the ignorance Stockman displays about agriculture when he supposedly grew up on a dairy farm.

"Why (do) the taxpayers of this country have the responsibility to go in and finance debt that was willingly incurred by consenting adults?" asked Stockman.

Why indeed?

At the risk of sounding very basic about the nation's overall farm situation, Stockman's question deserves an answer: Because agriculture is different from virtually any other business in this country.

Agriculture is different because it does not have the ability to price its own products as it passes them into the food chain. Any other business has that ability to monitor its cost of production, add a fair profit and make its own price within the framework of competition from other businesses.

Secondly, agriculture is different because it is weather dependent. The whims of nature have as much to do with final production figures as the best laid plans of individual farmers.

And thirdly, agriculture is different because the heavy hand of government is involved in its decisions—economic and otherwise. And because the government is involved, virtually every decision comes down on the side of plenty to insure a ready supply of cheap food for its people the majority of which are not involved in producing that food.

Agriculture's current dilemma stems as much from government decisions and policy making as it does from the collective individual decisions of millions of "consenting adult" producers. It was official U.S. government policy that this nation's farmers were going to produce all-out to feed the world. And the payoffs would be a use of agricultural exports to industrialized nations who could afford to pay to help decrease a balance of trade deficit that was getting dangerously out of hand. And those countries that could not afford to pay would be kept within the American sphere of influence by being provided food at reasonable cost to keep down agitation and unsettling of governments.

That was the mood of government in the seventies. It was an ambitious, expansionistic foreign policy decision to use this country's comparative advantage in food production to its utmost. Maybe we couldn't build cars and cameras and computers competitively anymore. One thing we could do, though, was farm and that we could do with the best.

Selling grain to Russia was more than just a way to earn cash to pay a highly inflated

OPEC oil bill. It was a way to demonstrate to the Russians and the rest of the world that their system wasn't working and ours was. Helping feed starving Ethiopians with the largesse of American farms would show the world that we are still a capable, compassionate people and that it is wise to stay on our good side.

The trap, of course, is that nothing stands still. Something is bound to change. As OPEC gouged the industrialized nations with higher and higher oil prices that ricocheted through economies, inflation then recession were the ultimate results. Again it was agriculture that was the shining light. The dollar, once weak, became strong again. Now agriculture and its people suffer even though the general economy strengthens daily.

Those are some of the reasons why Washington owes farmers more than a quick switch to a totally market-oriented system that will devastate family farms across the country. ●

WHY DEFICITS MATTER

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, February 27, 1985, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHY DEFICITS MATTER

For some time I had been expecting the question, and at a recent public meeting it came. "You talk all the time about getting the deficit down. Why does it matter? We have an annual deficit of \$220 billion and a national debt of \$1.68 trillion. But things have gone well the past few years and they are going well now."

It's a fair question, and one that is on the minds of many Hoosiers. Many argue that the big deficits really do not matter. After all, the deficits of recent years have not led to economic disaster. The economy has boomed. The deficits mean that government is putting more money into the hands of people than it is taking away in taxes. Increased federal spending meant higher production and more jobs. Inflation dropped. Signs of confidence in the economy still abound.

Nonetheless, these debts pose a serious, if unapparent, danger. They inhibit capital formation, lead to higher interest rates, and put us at a disadvantage in world markets. These threats may not be visible to the average person, and they will not prevent the economy from doing well in the short term. But the damage is, in my view, long term and cumulative. The fact that the dangers are intangible at the moment is part of the problem in making people aware of the risks.

The deficits are already causing problems in the economy. The current economic recovery, now in its third year, is beginning to show weaknesses. Government borrowing to finance the deficit reduces the amount of credit available for private borrowing and drives interest rates up. Interest rates today are more than three times higher than they were in the 1970's. Industries sensitive to interest rates, such as housing, have suffered as a result. Unemployment is still higher than it was prior to the recession, and some sectors of the economy, such as agriculture,

have not shared in the growth of the economy. Many bank loans do not meet quality standards and the debt burden of developing countries has not been solved. If the economy begins to slow down, the budget deficit, and the problems associated with it, will get worse.

The deficits are also harming our trade efforts. High interest rates increase the value of the dollar, now at a record high against most foreign currencies. The appreciation of the dollar makes our exports expensive in foreign countries while imports are cheap at home. The result is a massive trade deficit and serious problems in industries with foreign competitors, including agriculture. The flood of cheap imports, combined with sluggish exports by American industries, has devastated many industries, causing the loss of hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of jobs. New trouble spots are emerging. Goods other than high technology have suffered trade deficits for several years. The overvalued dollar is now causing exports of capital equipment and high technology products to drop while imports are increasing dramatically. Pressure is increasing to protect vulnerable domestic industries from foreign competition. In the long run, however, protectionism rewards inefficient domestic industries, incites retaliation against U.S. goods in foreign markets and threatens trade critical to economic development. These problems will grow if the deficit is not reduced.

The deficits also make our economy dependent on foreign investment. High interest rates and the strength and stability of the U.S. economy attract foreign investment. Foreign assets in the United States have increased 50 percent since 1980. This year, the United States will become an international debtor for the first time in 100 years, as foreign investments in this country overtake U.S. assets abroad. Since 1983, over half of the budget deficit has been financed directly or indirectly by foreign investors. An increasing proportion of U.S. productive capacity is owned by foreign investors and an increasing share of our national income goes to pay interest and dividends to foreigners, causing a decline in growth and living standards at home. Worse yet, foreign investors might decide to withdraw from U.S. markets. Under the best circumstances, foreign investors would withdraw gradually, causing a modest decline in economic growth. But they could pull out suddenly. Rapid flight would cause a sharp drop in the value of the dollar and in interest rates, seriously threatening our economic stability.

In the longer term, the end of foreign investment in the United States would mean that the huge U.S. deficits will have to be financed from savings here. Private U.S. investment would then have to compete with federal deficits for that savings. The U.S. Government will crowd private borrowers out of the market, leading to a sharp decline in capital formation, productivity and ultimately in our standards of living.

Finally, the growing burden of the federal debt increases the share of the federal budget that must be devoted to interest payments. Our interest burden is exploding, jumping under current policies from \$69 billion in 1981 to an anticipated \$231 billion in 1990. The interest the government pays on the national debt has soared from less than \$131 per person in 1960 to more than \$500 per person this year. At the current rate, it will go to almost \$1,000 by 1990. If current practices continue, the government will

have to abandon many normal operations simply to pay interest on the debt. Reducing the deficit becomes more difficult each year and the risk grows that the United States will try to "solve" the problem by increasing the money supply. Already there are calls for easier money to stimulate growth. A flood of money would increase growth, but at the cost of increased inflation.

We may succeed for a while in deferring the remedy, as we are now doing, but in the end we will have to pay for the deficits with draconian spending cuts, higher taxes, or inflation. The deficit is like a long-term cancer, slow-acting but potentially lethal. We have avoided disaster so far, but it is dangerous to say that no action is needed now. We may be lucky for another year or so but the odds worsen with each passing month.●

PEER COUNSELING FOR MS VICTIMS

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues a recent Judy Mann column from the Washington Post regarding a peer counseling program for multiple sclerosis sufferers conducted by the National Multiple Sclerosis Society's National Capital Chapter, which serves Montgomery and Prince George's County, MD, northern Virginia, and the District of Columbia. The program has produced extraordinary results, with all of the 300 individual who have completed the program since 1980 now either employed, in school, doing volunteer work or involved in physical rehabilitation programs. The success of the program is especially significant considering that it costs the taxpayers only \$150,000 per year. Indeed, it is an excellent example of how Government programs can be effective if efficiently run and targeted. The peer counseling program of the national chapter of the National MS Society should be used as a model for future efforts.

The column follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 13, 1985]

THE BATTLE AGAINST MS

(By Judy Mann)

Multiple sclerosis is a disease of the central nervous system in which the covering around the nerves is damaged, interrupting the flow of messages to parts of the body. Young white women are afflicted with the disease more than any other group. Its symptoms include visual problems, lack of coordination, weakness or stiffness of limbs, fatigue and partial paralysis. It affects each victim differently and episodes occur unpredictably and with varying degrees of severity.

In 1978, the National Capital Chapter of the National Multiple Sclerosis Society began training 16 afflicted women to help newly diagnosed patients cope with their illness. "We had an unanticipated result," recalls Marianne Rose. "People started going

back to work or school." The experience in peer counseling led to a three-year grant from the Education Department's Rehabilitation Services Administration for the chapter to set up a job bank, which would be a pilot project for the entire country.

It began in 1980 and has produced extraordinary results: Of the 300 people who completed the program—people who were not employed, some of whom had suffered extreme paralysis and psychological devastation—61 percent are now employed full or part time. The others are in school, doing volunteer work, in physical rehabilitation programs or trying out jobs.

"MS is a disease of loss and fear of more loss," says Diane Afes, director of chapter services. "Most agencies have counseling, but they don't think about employment. We had the typical agency view of this." About 20 percent of the victims, she explains, progressively deteriorate to a point where they are paralyzed or legally blind or both. Another 20 percent suffer symptoms such as blurred vision and stumbling while they are in their 20s and then have more severe attacks that lead to a diagnosis, but the disease goes into remission for long periods of time. The other 60 percent of the victims "fall in between," she says. "They have ups and downs, but over the years it is still a descending staircase. It's unpredictable and it's difficult to plan one's life." Stress and fatigue can exacerbate the condition.

One of the graduates of Operation Job Match was a 29-year-old woman who had an MBA. Three weeks after the birth of her baby, she was paralyzed from the neck down. The diagnosis was MS. She recovered from the paralysis, but "she thought her work and career life was over," says Rose.

The woman began the two-month back-to-work training program, which is conducted in sessions of about a dozen people that are led by other MS patients who have already completed the program and are working. The group meets in two-hour sessions one day a week, building a support system at first, and then learning techniques of stress management. This particular young woman, says Rose, "was worrying so much she was making herself sicker. She studied biofeedback and turned it into a method for controlling her symptoms."

In subsequent sessions, the groups learn assertiveness training and what abilities they have in light of the disease and evaluate whether they can work full or part time and what work accommodations each would need. Later, they work on resumes and practice job interviews, particularly how to tell a prospective employer that they have MS. The job match program supplies names of potential employers. The young woman in point, who thought her career was over, now works full time for the government.

MS affects about 250,000 people nationally and about 2,000 in the Washington area. Since it usually strikes young adults, its victims are often skilled, educated people who have no experience with disabilities. Often they quit work or school long before they have to, says Rose. In many cases they become so fatigued in their work that they decide to quit, when minor accommodations in their work patterns would enable them to remain employed.

"It's amazing how clients change," says Karen Franklin, job developer for the program. "They just blossom."

Hundreds of people who were ready to give up have gotten work, hope, reasons to get up in the morning. Others who were getting disability stipends are now self-support-

ing. They have learned—and taught others—that a disability is not inability. The local chapter is looking for funding from private industry to expand its services and to set up internships in jobs that are particularly well-suited for MS patients.

The program's stunning rate of success—at the relatively low cost of \$150,000 a year—should make it a model for similar efforts throughout the country. This is federal money well spent, indeed.●

HARSHER PENALTIES FOR DRUG TRAFFICKERS ARE NECESSARY

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month I introduced legislation, H.R. 994, the Controlled Substances Penalties Act of 1985, that would increase the penalties for those convicted of drug trafficking or smuggling in large amounts. My bill would also deny bond in cases involving larger amounts of narcotic drugs. Recent events clearly underline the need for tougher legislation to combat the growing problem of domestic and international drug trafficking.

Earlier this month in Warren, OH—which is my home district—local police officials seized more than 2 pounds—slightly over 1 kilogram—of cocaine and arrested one man. The man was charged with drug trafficking and bond was set at \$100,000. Later that same day the bond was posted and the suspect was free to go. Although the suspect was listed by the State as unemployed for over 1 year, he owns five houses worth \$152,000, seven cars, a boat and airplane, in addition to other assets. It is clear that the suspect probably makes a lucrative living off illicit drug activity and that he most likely has access to the financial resources and international connections to easily transport him out of the country. The fact that the suspect was able to post bond so easily and the very nature of his financial assets and connections makes him a high flight risk.

Because my bill would specifically deny bond in cases involving a kilogram or more of cocaine, it would ensure that these powerful drug traffickers remain in this country to stand trial for their crimes. The recent case in Warren, OH is typical—invariably those charged with drug trafficking or smuggling easily post bond and have the financial resources to leave the country—if they so desire. The very nature of international drug trafficking makes it imperative that action be taken at the Federal level to ensure that the big-time operator and "mastermind" does not post bond and leave the country. Not only would my bill

prevent this from happening, it would also provide the judge with the option of imposing stiffer penalties on those convicted of drug trafficking or smuggling. First offenders could receive up to 30 years in prison and/or up to \$500,000 in fines. Second offenders could receive a maximum penalty of life imprisonment, or if they resist arrest, kill or injure a law enforcement officer or civilian, or are armed with a dangerous weapon, they would be subject to the death penalty option.

The need to get tough on drug traffickers has always been great, and this body has led the way in forging tougher laws. But we need to go one step further. The big-time operators need to be isolated from the small-time dealer and the common drug addict. My bill, by clearly delineating the higher levels of narcotic drug trafficking that would require stiffer penalties and the no-bond clause, would affect only those cases involving bulk amounts or shipments of narcotic drugs. My bill would provide the courts with the option of imposing stiff sentences. As a former sheriff I recognize that cases do vary—my bill would give the courts leeway to decide upon appropriate punishment. My bill would provide judges with the option of imposing very stiff sentences to serious offenders and dangerous drug dealers—who are not only poisoning our youth with deadly drugs—but who are also endangering the lives of this Nation's law enforcement officers trying to combat illicit drug activity.

The recent kidnapping of DEA agent Enrique Salazar Camarena in Guadalajara, Mexico, is a clear example that international drug trafficking is a widespread problem and a very real threat to our society. Passage of my bill would send a strong message to the entire world that America has had enough and that we will no longer tolerate the poisoning of our youth and that those who choose to confront our law enforcement officers and endanger their lives will pay dearly for their crimes. Drug trafficking and smuggling has become both a national and global problem. As a former sheriff I have had firsthand experience with this problem and I can attest to the grave threat big-time drug traffickers and smugglers pose to the law enforcement community and the general public. As former director of the Mahoning County Drug Program in Ohio, I can also attest to the tragic proportions the problem of drug abuse has reached in this country. Everyday young men and women—even unborn babies—fall victim to drug abuse. Those ultimately responsible for poisoning our youth with these dangerous drugs are the "masterminds" who coordinate and supervise huge drug transactions both at a national and international level. The time has come to declare all-out war on those who are

destroying our youth and the very fabric of our society.

H.R. 994 is but one more step in the fight against drugs—but it is a very important step and one that must be taken. I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation. ●

WHAT AMERICANISM MEANS TO ME CONTEST

HON. DONALD J. PEASE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and the rest of the Members of the House of Representatives take a moment to read the following essay on Americanism which was written by a student at Norwalk High School in my Ohio district. He was the third-place winner in the "What Americanism Means to Me" essay contest held annually by the Americanism Foundation.

WHAT AMERICANISM MEANS TO ME

(By John Kompa, Norwalk High School)

When asked what Americanism means to me, I find it hard to say in just a few words what it actually means but instead I feel that it can be expressed as a feeling of belonging and pride, plus a sense of duty and responsibility to the United States of America that can only be acquired through living and learning about the development of this great country. If one thinks of all the men who have died to preserve America for their families and for posterity one realizes just how unique this land is.

There are so many different freedoms in this country that exist exclusively here. Where else can one do what he wants when he wants? Where else can one print what he wants, worship whatever he chooses and vote for our nation's leaders. All these privileges must be observed and performed with moderation but still this is so special that we can truly call America "The home of the free and the brave." One must realize how important and valuable these values are; one must realize how essential they are to continuing our present society. By observing these values one must willingly and wholeheartedly accept his role in making certain that they endure. No matter how minute the role the average citizen plays, it is still important. Without the citizen of the United States, which is the backbone of the country, the whole idea of equal opportunity could be tragically lost.

The responsibilities are numerous but the most important one is to be informed so one can see what is occurring in the diplomatic scene. How can one be proud to be an American and have a great sense of Americanism if he does not notice the developments and everyday actions of his government. After seeing how the process of government and everyday law one can truly appreciate the specialty of the situation. This provides an essential picture of how the government is run and how it must remain for a healthy America.

When you begin to criticize the government and its actions just ask yourself if you really know the ignorance of your bickering. Would you rather be a pauper in a Soviet block country or be one of the dirt-poor na-

tives of IndoChina and Asia. This often helps one to see how fortunate he actually is. You can only draw one statement: No matter how wrong a law or action might seem that it is, it is still better than the laws of the other countries that have no set constitution or guidelines. After you consider all these things and you still have a valid argument, then it is your duty and privilege to speak out.

Even though a citizen might disagree over an issue, he should still have faith and believe in America. It is only obvious that this is one of the main facets of Americanism; faith in the government that has proven time after time that the United States is a country that has no rivals and that in many ways we are an ideal society but not perfect. America is the standard that other countries are compared to, often they try to duplicate various aspects of our culture and government but it is unsuccessful because of one reason: the people. The people of America are like no other in the world and they are what Americanism is all about. As long as the citizen of today remains true to his duty, which is a certain true statement, then America will remain the great land that it is today.

In conclusion, I feel that Americanism is a sense of love, duty, and responsibility for the United States of America. It is also a sense of belonging to the greatest nation known to man today. ●

REAGAN'S FOREIGN AID PROPOSALS EMPHASIZE "SECURITY ASSISTANCE"

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, a review of the President's proposed budget can be upsetting for those who do not necessarily agree with his priorities. Although I am distressed by his domestic policies, as reflected in the budget, his foreign policies must concern all Americans who do not wish to be dragged into an increasing number of conflicts throughout the world.

The article below, which appeared in the February 7, 1985 Christian Science Monitor, points out the continuing shift toward foreign aid in the form of "security assistance." The idea of spreading weapons around the world in this manner has got to give us all pause. The costs of these weapons to the intended victims or the costs of the ill will that will be focused on our country are staggering. It is my hope that all of my colleagues will consider any foreign aid carefully and recognize that the river of so much death and destruction is bound to create more enemies than friends.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 7, 1985]

REAGAN'S FOREIGN AID PROPOSALS EMPHASIZE "SECURITY ASSISTANCE"

(By George D. Moffett III)

President Reagan's foreign aid proposals for fiscal year 1986 signal a continuing

trend toward higher levels of military assistance, gradual reductions in traditional economic aid, and a greater concentration of U.S. aid in regions the administration says are critical to U.S. security—especially the Middle East and Central America.

In budget announcements this week, the White House left unclear its short-term plans for economic assistance to Israel, pending confirmation by the Israelis that adequate measures have been taken to respond to the nation's worst economic crisis. The administration did not clarify its long-term plans for future United States funding of the International Development Association, a branch of the World Bank that is the largest single source of interest-free aid to the poorest countries.

Details provided by administration spokesmen indicate that "security assistance"—that is, military aid combined with economic support earmarked for key U.S. allies around the world—will increase by more than \$1 billion this year and could go higher if the President consents to aid increases proposed by Israel for next year.

At the same time, levels of "development assistance"—that is, aid for agricultural development, health clinics, nutrition programs, and the like in poor countries—will decline by close to \$500 million. Those cuts will come principally at the expense of health care, population planning, food-aid programs, UNICEF (the UN Children's Emergency Fund), and the UN Development Program.

According to a recent Overseas Development Council study, the shift in U.S. aid away from development assistance began in the late 1970s with pledges made in the Camp David Accords. The trend was accelerated by successive crises in Afghanistan and Iran. Since then, U.S. security assistance has been used increasingly to bolster stability in regions like Central America and the Middle East. If the Reagan administration has its way, close to two-thirds of all U.S. aid next year will be in the form of security assistance. The trend is underscored in Africa where, over the past three years, food aid has risen by 40 percent while military assistance has gone up 150 percent.

The principal beneficiaries of the shift toward security assistance are Israel and Egypt together with Spain, Portugal, Greece, Turkey, and the Philippines, which provide the United States with military base rights. These seven nations will receive almost three-fourths of all U.S. security assistance.

Another beneficiary has been Central America. This year marks the third of a five-year, \$8 billion aid program pledged by the Reagan administration in response to the recommendations of the 1983 Kissinger Commission. The 1986 budget provides for a big increase for Honduras, which has provided a home base for rebel forces, the so-called Contras, fighting to overthrow the Sandinista regime in Nicaragua and Guatemala. Honduras will get its first transfusion of U.S. military aid since 1977. Aid to Guatemala will jump in 1986 from \$300,000 to \$35 million. The administration's new aid budget also provides increased funding to three South American nations—Ecuador, Peru, and Bolivia—where fragile new democratic governments are facing economic and political threats.

In a related development, the administration this week announced changes in a program administered by the Export/Import Bank to help foreign purchasers buy U.S. products. The plan is to replace the current

program of direct loans with private loan guarantees. This has produced angry reactions from the U.S. business community. Treasury Department spokesmen say direct loans are no longer needed, since other major exporting nations have cut back on levels of export subsidies. Business sources say that at a time of massive U.S. trade imbalances, the shift away from direct loans will hurt. The change "signals our competitors that we're withdrawing from competition in the world market," says Willard Berry, president of the Coalition for Employment Through Export, an organization representing some 14 industrial unions in the United States. He says business, labor, and state governors will "devote a lot of energy" to repealing the proposed changes.

Congressional sources say the new aid budget will raise again the perennial question of whether military spending is the best way to shore up U.S. security interests around the world. Proponents of development aid say the new budget perpetuates a trend that, over the past year, has reduced, on a per capita basis the amount of that type of aid going to those in the second-lowest level among developing countries. They say that, in addition to humanitarian consequences, the policy ignores the national-security threat posed by the contribution poverty makes to political instability and regional tensions in strategically important areas.

The last time Congress passed a foreign aid authorization bill was in 1981, and congressional aides say that with no consensus on the security-vs.-development issue, plus other controversies, finding a working majority to pass and aid bill could be difficult again this year.

THE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues are aware the administration's budget request for fiscal year 1986 recommends the elimination of the subsidy for lunches served to school children from families with incomes above 185 percent of the poverty level. In actuality, however, since school's receive lump sums for lunches, the proposal will reach many children who will be eligible for the program, but who will not receive the benefits when schools drop out en masse for lack of sufficient funds.

To help my colleagues fully evaluate the harsh effects of the administration's plan I insert here testimony given by Mr. Charles Hughes, chairperson of the AFSCME School Employee Advisory Committee and president of local 372, Board of Education Employees, District Council 37, New York City, before the House Education and Labor Committee this week. Mr. Hughes calls this proposal a potential "national disaster" and after reading his remarks. I am sure many will agree.

Good morning Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee.

My name is Charles Hughes. I would like to thank you for the opportunity of again testifying before this Committee.

I am the Chairperson of the America Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees' School Employees Advisory Committee, representing 150,000 members.

I am also the President of Local 372, Board of Education Employees, District Council 37, in New York City. We are the largest union working in the nation's largest school lunch program. On an average day, our members serve about 500,000 lunches to children participating in the National School Lunch Program.

As one who has been around for some time, I have grown to understand the value of this program to the strength and vitality of our nation. It is a program which invests in the future of our nation by investing in its children. I am proud to be a member and an official in a union that has supported it since its inception in 1946 and of a union whose members have contributed greatly to its growth and effectiveness.

It is, indeed, a sad and distressing fact that we are confronted today with the very real possibility of seeing this program destroyed.

I am not a doomsayer in making this statement. This is precisely what lies ahead if the President's Fiscal Year 1986 proposals are approved by the Congress. This national disaster must be averted.

Four short years ago, the Administration spearheaded a major assault on the program. Many school districts have yet to recover from it. Federal funding was cut by \$1.0 billion largely by reducing Federal reimbursement for school lunches, raising the price charged to the child, and tightening eligibility and verification requirements. The direct result of these actions has been that nearly 3,000 schools and three and one half million children were forced out of the program. As we look back on all of this, we have to ask ourselves several questions. Did the end results justify the means? Is the condition of our nation's children stronger and the national deficit lower today because of this harsh action? I believe the answers are self-evident.

We are warned, Mr. Chairman, that those who forget the lessons of history are condemned to repeat them. This Administration, I submit, apparently forgets too easily. Why else would they not leave well enough alone?

Sure, we face the largest deficit in our nation's history. And, sure enough, we've got to attack and eliminate the causes that got us in the box we're in. But, for gracious sake, how far can we tamper with truth and fairness by implying that the cost to the Federal government in feeding the nation's school children is one of them!

The Administration's fiscal year 1986 budget proposes to reduce expenditures in Child Nutrition programs by \$648 million in fiscal year 1986, \$906 million in fiscal year 1987 and \$1 billion in fiscal year 1988.

Its major recommendation is to eliminate the present subsidy, as provided in Section 4 of the National School Lunch Act, for lunches served to children with family income above 185 percent of poverty. I say to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the members of the Committee, that the approval of this proposal will seal the coffin on this program in school districts across the country.

The National School Lunch program is not tailored for children from any one income level. It is designed—as it should be—for all children, including the poor and

near poor. Generally speaking, the program is financed by three sources: cash and commodities from the Federal Government (50-55 percent); state and local matching funds (20 percent); and student payments (20-25 percent). In order for the program to survive and to include all children regardless of their families economic condition, participation by all children is essential. This is particularly vital in schools in which there are substantial numbers of full pay students.

These are the children the Administration is targeting. Its proposal to eliminate the Section 4 subsidy on their school lunches will force school districts to raise the price they will have to pay. The consequences of this action are not difficult to predict. Hordes of full pay students will abandon the program. As this happens, schools will find it economically unfeasible to continue to operate them. And when they are compelled to close operations, the needy children receiving free lunches and those students who are reduced priced pay students will no longer have access to the program.

A recent report by the Congressional Research Service which was submitted to your Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education supports these conclusions. The report indicates that the elimination of the projected 24.75 cents in cash and commodity subsidies for full paid lunches that the Administration is proposing would translate to a 19.8 percent reduction in participation. Using Fiscal Year 1984 participation data, this would translate to 2.31 million paid lunch children dropping out of the program if paid subsidies were eliminated. The report further states that those schools with the highest proportion of paid lunches (or the lowest proportion of free and reduced price lunches) will be most dramatically affected by the elimination of the paid subsidy and in greatest possible risk of dropping from the program entirely. It concludes that if such school drop-out occurs, all of the children in the school would lose access to the program, an estimated 7.3 million children.

In my own State of New York, it has been estimated that the termination of the full pay subsidy would result in over 240,000 children being dropped from the program. Furthermore, it is estimated that 413, or 38 percent of New York's 1,097 food authorities, would be forced to drop their School Lunch Programs if this proposal is enacted.

But as devastating as this proposal is, the Administration does not stop here. It also proposes to end the cost of living, or inflation, adjustment on child nutrition meal reimbursement rates, including school lunch and the special milk program. This reduction would have a devastating effect on urban and poor school districts, where over 90% of their lunches are served to students who qualify for free or reduced priced meals. In New York State alone, we estimate that this measure would reduce Federal outlays by \$35 million and would cost institutions in the State approximately \$3 million.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot turn our backs on the children of our land. I am profoundly aware of your personal commitment to them. Were it not for the work and dedication of this Committee over many years, we would not have a National School Lunch Program.

On behalf of our members in AFSCME, I urge you to continue to act to preserve this program by rejecting these proposals.

Briefly, may I turn to other matters of extreme importance not only to the School

Lunch Program but also to vital programs affecting the well-being of children.

AFSCME commends you for re-introducing H.R. 7. It is unfortunate that this legislation was not acted upon by the Senate after it has been approved by the House during the last session. This legislation re-authorizes five crucial programs: the Women, Infant, and Children Program (WIC), the Summer Food Service Program; the Commodity Distribution Program; the Nutrition Education and Training Program; and State Administration Expenses. Further, it sets realistic authorization levels for these programs and proposes other positive revisions which we fully support.

AFSCME urges the early enactment of this legislation into law.

We would also recommend that your Committee take two other actions which AFSCME believes are essential.

As you know, in 1981 Federal funds were eliminated for the Food Service Equipment Assistance Program in the National School Lunch Program. The damage that this has caused school districts in not being able to properly maintain their food service equipment must be corrected. H.R. 610, which was introduced by Congressman Solarz from my City, is intended to do exactly this. It would restore the \$15 million previously authorized for this purpose.

AFSCME urges the Committee to expedite action on, and to approve, this legislation.

Finally, we would recommend that your Committee give serious consideration to increasing the \$5 million authorization level for Nutrition, Education, and Training services in the School Lunch Program. Since its inception in 1977, this provision has shown clearly that these services strengthen quality of the programs. In order to achieve greater progress, we would recommend that the authorization level be increased to \$10 million.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman. It has always been a pleasure for me to testify before your Committee. I would be happy to respond to any questions.●

G. RAY ARNETT TO HEAD NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION

HON. JOHN B. BREAUX

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, last week the National Rifle Association, by a unanimous vote of its board of directors, elected G. Ray Arnett as their executive vice president. It is hard to imagine a more fitting selection. In every aspect in life, including physical size, Ray towers above the field.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment and as someone who has often hunted with Ray, I know that he is both a great shot and a great conservationist. His knowledge of weapons is extensive, and he handles them well in the activity that is of prime interest to American sportsmen, the pursuit of game. Ray has hunted all over the world, always with a sense of adventure as well as a love for the hunt and a respect for the outdoors. He is someone who is at home in both

the posh hunting clubs of the eastern shore or the ramshackle duck camps of the Louisiana marshes.

Combined with his love of hunting is a love of wildlife and the natural world it inhabits. Ray has served as director of the California Department of Fish and Game, and Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks as well as president of the National Wildlife Federation. In all of these positions, Ray has been a tireless advocate of the wise use of our natural resources and a spokesman for the American sportsmen.

We must also acknowledge that the National Rifle Association is quite often involved in controversy relating to the rights of Americans to bear arms. Ray brings to the job a thorough knowledge of the political process and the formation of Government policy as well as a strong commitment to second amendment rights. Ray will be an effective and rational spokesman on the key issues that affect NRA's membership.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great personal pleasure that I congratulate both the NRA and my good friend and duck blind partner on the beginning of what I believe will be a long and strong period of leadership by one of America's foremost advocates of the shooting sports, G. Ray Arnett.●

TRIBUTE TO RAY "BOOM BOOM" MANCINI

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to pay tribute to a constituent of mine who has made a lasting mark on the hearts and minds of all Americans—especially those from his hometown of Youngstown, OH—Mr. Speaker, I am speaking of Ray "Boom Boom" Mancini, former WBA lightweight boxing champion, who recently attempted a comeback in the ring.

Last June, Ray lost his title to Livingstone Bramble. Last week Ray attempted to win back his title. In what has been described by many as one of the greatest lightweight fights ever, Ray went the full 15 rounds and lost a close decision. Even though he lost the fight Ray's performance was truly magnificent. Although he was cut badly over both eyes Ray fought on and refused to quit. At times Ray could barely see, yet he stood toe to toe with Bramble and continued to pound away.

Ray Mancini's guts and determination needs to be applauded by all who truly admire human spirit and courage. Throughout his career Ray fought with a single-minded intensity

and raw courage that catapulted him to the title. Ray's recent loss and his failure to regain his title in no way diminishes the magnitude of his accomplishments or the measure of his immense character and courage. Whether or not Ray ever enters the ring again he will always be remembered as a champion—a battler and a fighter who never gave up. Ray is a man who pursued a lifelong dream and made that dream a reality. Through his exploits in the ring Ray has inspired not only the people of his hometown—Youngstown—but also the people of this Nation, who always seem to reach out to and identify with a fighter and a battler.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored today, not only to pay tribute to Ray Mancini, but also that a person of Ray's character has joined my task force back in Youngstown to attract General Motors' new Saturn project to Youngstown. I can't think of anyone I'd more like to represent this massive community effort than Ray Mancini. Like "Boom Boom," the people in my district have experienced great adversity—but that have not given up. Despite having one of the highest unemployment rates in the country the people in my district have adopted Ray's fighting spirit. The people in the Mahoning Valley have pulled together in an unprecedented community effort to attract Saturn. This effort has resulted in the development of a progressive financial and economic package designed to attract—not only Saturn—but other new and expanding industries. By working together to develop this package the people in my district have taken their future into their own hands. Like Ray "Boom Boom" Mancini we have not given up; we are fighting back against economic adversity.

Ray Mancini was one of the first to pledge his full support for this historic effort. I am confident that with the help and inspiration of people like Ray Mancini the people in my district can overcome their problems and can mold themselves a bright future. I am confident also that Ray Mancini will succeed in whatever he chooses to do. In the hearts and minds of all Americans Ray will always be the champ.●

FILIPINO WORLD WAR II VETERANS

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that would provide relief to Filipino World War II veterans facing possible deportation from this country. My bill would simply extend the date which these

veterans should petition the Immigration and Naturalization Service [INS] for naturalization. It restricts this opportunity to those veterans already in the United States. These applicants would have been otherwise eligible for citizenship pursuant to the provisions contained in the Nationality Act of 1940 which were in effect before December 24, 1952.

In March 1942, Congress amended the Nationality Act of 1940 to allow for the naturalization of noncitizens who served honorably in our armed services during World War II. The Filipino soldiers, however, were unable to take advantage of this opportunity for 9 months due to the absence of an INS officer in the Philippines. This was a result of a decision by the Attorney General to remove the naturalization examiner from the Philippines.

On January 10, 1984, these veterans suffered another setback in their pursuit of U.S. citizenship. The high court ruled in United States against Mendoza that the Justice Department is not prohibited by a previous decision from challenging the citizenship applications of these Filipino veterans. This implies that the INS may proceed to deport these individuals upon denial of their citizenship applications.

Mr. Speaker, I am referring to some 1,660 residents in the State of California and an unknown number scattered throughout the United States. These are law-abiding individuals who have spent their lives since World War II contributing to our societies, and establishing their families in this country. We, as a country, failed to implement the full extent of our own law, and now we are contemplating deportation. That is unconscionable.

I do not believe that this problem is for the courts or the INS to decide. On the contrary, I believe that a simple act of Congress can resolve this matter. It is clear that if the INS officer was present for the entire duration of the eligibility period in the Philippines as was legislated, there would not be a problem. Therefore, reinstating the 9 months would be the fairest action to take. My bill, however, provides an extension short of 9 months, but nevertheless the opportunity is provided to fulfill a promise and prevent deportation. This is the least we could do to repay these honorable veterans. Mr. Speaker, I urge expedient consideration of this measure.●

A BLACK HISTORY MONTH TRIBUTE TO CHESTER HIMES

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, February is Black History Month. During

the month-long celebration, it is important for each of us to reflect upon the contributions of black Americans to the history and culture of this Nation. The sciences, education, politics, technology, and the arts are a few areas in which black Americans have helped make America great.

Mr. Speaker, today, to take one area, literature, and talk about the contributions of black Americans. Countless black Americans have distinguished themselves as poets, writers, and essayists. Many of them are well-known in America and abroad.

Phyllis Wheatly, a black woman born in the 18th century, was among the first poets in America. During the exciting period known as the Harlem Renaissance, the names Countee Cullen, Langston Hughes, Arna Bon Temps, and Ralph Ellison became synonymous with literary genius. Today, James Baldwin, Maya Angelou, Toni Morrison, and Alex Haley are a few of America's celebrated writers.

Mr. Speaker, these are a few of the names that many Americans know. However, there are a number of black writers and poets who are not as well known. The late Chester Himes is one of them.

A former resident of Cleveland, Himes died last November in Spain at the age of 75. During his lifetime, Himes received only marginal recognition in America. However, in Europe, the novels of Chester Himes won critical acclaim.

Since his death, there has been a renewed interest in this country in the books of Chester Himes. However, because of the limited number of available copies of his books in America, many people have not had an opportunity to read his novels.

Therefore, at this time, I would like to share the work of the late Chester Himes with my colleagues. Reporter Joe Frolik wrote an exceptional article on the life and work of Chester Himes which appeared in the February 25, 1985, Cleveland Plain Dealer. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I ask that it be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CHESTER HIMES: HE BEGAN WRITING IN THE
OHIO PEN

(By Joe Frolik)

Calvin C. Hernton, distinguished essayist and professor of black studies at Oberlin College, counts himself among the fans of novelist Chester Himes, who died in Spain last November at age 75.

"He's a master craftsman," Hernton said of Himes, a former Cleveland resident who began writing while in the old Ohio Penitentiary. "His dialog is superb. His character development, his plotting, the way he organizes the material, all are unmistakably indicative of a master literary craftsman."

"And when it comes to treatment or perspective, the same is true. He has an impeccable moral character running through his writing. . . . No one is spared. There is a

rather stark portrayal of the frailty and immensity of human nature."

With such strong feelings, it's no wonder Hernton always tries to include a book by Himes when he teaches a seminar on the black American novel. Yet, he is often unable to because bookstores cannot dig up even the handful of copies required.

Literature professors at other colleges and universities report the same problem. Some, like Howard University's Eugenia Collier, say that while they respect Himes and would like to devote more attention to him, they pass over him in their survey classes to focus on such Himes contemporaries as Richard Wright and Ralph Ellison.

"I consider him an important writer. He's in the textbook we use and on the syllabus," said Collier. "But we spent so much time on (Wright's classic) 'Native Son,' we had to skip someone."

It has been that way almost from the moment Himes published his first novel, "If He Hollers Let Him Go," in 1945. There always has been a loyal core of enthusiastic admirers like Hernton. But in general, Himes' critical reputation has ridden a roller-coaster, and his books always have been hard to come by—in the United States, that is.

Overseas, especially in Western Europe, it is another story. There, Himes long enjoyed wide popularity and respect. When he died after years of declining health, *Le Monde*, the Paris newspaper, devoted an entire page to his obituary.

In Alicante, Spain, where Himes spent his later years, a street was named after him. English publishers made plans to reissue the series of Harlem-based detective novels that inspired two popular movies of the early 1970s, "Cotton Comes to Harlem" and "Run, Charleston, Run."

A smaller-scale revival of interest in Himes may be brewing on these shores, too. Schocken Books of New York, in conjunction with a London publishing house, will distribute the detective novels. Movie producers have expressed interest in at least two of his books.

This month, Howard University Press published "A Case of Rape," a short novel set in Paris about four black men accused of raping a white woman. The book was written in the mid-1950s, and previously was available here only in a 1979 limited edition (very limited, actually—350 copies).

Howard has ordered a first printing of 5,000 copies and has distributed review copies in hopes of sparking interest in the book and in Himes himself. Howard Press executives, who agreed before Himes died to bring out the book, hope his death will focus special attention on the publication.

"We're treating it as an original publication," said Howard Press director Charles F. Harris. "That is one of the appeals it had to us. It's the kind of book people knew Chester Himes had written, but it's not been available."

New York literary agent Roslyn Targ, who represented Himes for 19 years, has been trying to persuade other publishers to reissue such novels as "Lonely Crusade" (1947), "The Third Generation" (1954), "The Primitive" (1955) and "Pinktoes" (1961).

"I have gone to every publisher in this city to reissue his books," Targ said, "and I've found nothing but deaf ears. Everywhere."

Targ's husband, William, former editor-in-chief of G.P. Putnam's Sons, brought out the 1979 edition of "A Case of Rape." She

doubts the book will make Himes the hot property in death that he never quite was in life.

"It's a very, very bitter book," said Targ. "I don't think it's representative, really, of the other books."

Instead, Targ is pinning her hopes on the reissued detective novels. She thinks if they do well, someone might be willing to bring out the other novels.

The struggle to get into print was a constant in Chester Bomar Himes' life. In various interviews and in his autobiography, he described in bitter details his run-ins with publishers.

He complained of puny advances and pirating, of the mysterious stop-print order issued as "If He Hollers" was entering the best-seller lists, of the weak support he received when a critical storm erupted around "The Lonely Crusade."

Himes attributed those problems and his poor sales record in this country to racism. Many of those who admire him agree, though some point out that by living abroad the last three decades of his life, Himes may have undermined whatever bargaining position he had with the publishing industry.

"I think most black writers or Indian writers or Hispanic writers do badly in this country," said novelist John A. Williams. "Basically, it's a question of literature done by minorities not being considered part of the mainstream."

Another black writer, Ishmael Reed, thinks Himes' style was difficult for critics to accept and understand, especially in the decades he was most prolific. Himes, Reed, said, was a product of the black oral tradition, and did not always adhere to standard literary techniques.

"Chester Himes wrote out of his experiences and the stories and tales he heard. He was not tied to any acceptable trend," Reed said. "It was raunchy and loud. It wasn't polite and genteel."

W. Maurice Shipley, professor of black studies at Ohio State University, thinks Himes also was a victim of poor timing. He emerged in the post-World War II years, just as Wright, Ellison and James Baldwin were preempting the small audience for black literature. Critics of the time kept comparing Himes to those giants, even though, Shipley said, they were doing very different things.

"They kept trying to find parallels between all of them," Shipley said, "and you can't do that."

There was a revival of interest in Himes in the early '60s, after "Pinktoes" enjoyed considerable success. But that, too, cooled as young, militant black writers captured the attention of readers anxious to get a pulse on America's racial unrest.

By then, Himes was writing his detective novels, and the adventures of Grave Digger Jones and Coffin Ed Johnson seemed irrelevant, especially since the Harlem they roamed was being created by an expatriate.

Yet, when two of those crime stories were turned into movies in the early '70s, Himes again was the subject of attention. His two-volume autobiography was published and several of his early novels reissued. That boomlet, too, passed as quickly as it had begun.

For most of his early life, Himes seemed an unlikely candidate for even momentary literary attention. He was born in 1909 in Jefferson City, Mo., where his father was teaching blacksmithing and wheelwrighting at a black college. The family traveled through several states before moving

to Cleveland, where young Chester entered East High School in 1925.

By the time he arrived here, Himes already had felt heavy doses of the racism that would figure so prominently in many of his books. In his autobiography, he remembered his mother sitting with a pistol as the family drove its touring car through rural Tennessee.

After an accident blinded his brother, Joseph, now a professor emeritus of sociology at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, the boy was turned away from the closest hospital, a whites-only facility. Even Himes' own family was racked by the growing animosity between his light-skinned mother and dark-skinned father.

Himes graduated from East High in January 1926; school records indicate he was a good pupil, but Himes later wrote that he got his 80 average in part by cheating. He planned to attend Ohio State that fall and took a job at Wade Park Manor, then a ritzy hotel, to earn money for school. While there, he tumbled down an elevator shaft and suffered a permanent back injury.

The state granted him a disability pension, and he used that to enroll at OSU. His career in Columbus was undistinguished. He wrote that he was more interested in the college lifestyle—he joined a fraternity, wore a coonskin coat, smoked a pipe and drove a Model-T—than in classwork. His freshman year had not ended when he was forced out of school after an off-campus incident at a whorehouse.

More trouble awaited him when he returned to Cleveland. He became a regular at gambling parlors on the near East Side. He worked as a bellhop at a downtown hotel, fetching bootleg liquor and prostitutes for conventioners. He had two minor run-ins with the law and was on probation in November 1928, when he robbed a Cleveland Heights couple at gunpoint of about \$5,500 in cash and jewelry.

Unfortunately for Himes, he was, by his own admission, an inept criminal. Within days, he was apprehended in Chicago, where he had hoped to fence the jewels and head for Mexico. Common Pleas Judge Walter McMahon sentenced him to 20 to 25 years in prison.

While at the Columbus penitentiary, Himes got involved in gambling and carried a knife. He barely escaped incineration in the Easter 1930 fire that killed 332 inmates. And he began to write.

His work appeared first in black newspapers and magazines, but his big break came in 1934, when *Esquire* magazine carried two of his stories. Himes was released in 1936 and, through dry spells and difficult times, he continued to consider himself a writer.

He left the U.S. in 1953, partly to escape racial discrimination. He also, he later admitted, was frightened by what he had become: Just before leaving, he had severely beaten the woman with whom he was living. Most of his 22 books were written abroad.

"He had a fantastic memory for detail," said Hernton. "You read the things he wrote after he had been gone from the United States for 20 years and you would think the guy still lives on the corner in Harlem, or wherever the story takes place."

"His books certainly stand up over time, they certainly record a period of time," said Williams, who knew Himes well and interviewed him at length in 1970. "And, unfortunately enough, there's a couple of generations now that have no idea how bad racism was . . . And Chester's covering it in many

areas—politics, the police force and daily life.

"They're not period pieces so much as pieces of history we don't know or perhaps don't even care to know." ●

TOWNS APPLAUDS PASSAGE OF FAMINE RELIEF BILL

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1985

● Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, the House's successful passage of the African Famine Relief Aid Act is an important step in ending the tragedy of hunger and starvation in Africa. Two dozen African countries are suffering from severe drought, deforestation, and massive movements of starving populations. H.R. 1096 combines both immediate humanitarian assistance with important development support which will assist these African countries in developing their agriculture to forestall future drought situations.

I was particularly pleased that this legislation provided a waiver of the Hickenlooper amendment which prohibits aid to countries that have expropriated U.S. property without adequate compensation. Without this waiver, Ethiopia would have been severely restricted in the type of aid that it could have received. We should use this waiver to encourage the Ethiopian Government to act responsibly in the distribution of food and humanitarian assistance to all the impacted areas without the country. I joined many of my colleagues in a letter to President Mengistu urging him to allow relief convoys into the provinces of Eritrea and Tigre. The Ethiopian Government should be encouraged to provide aid to all the impacted areas regardless of their ethnic or political affiliations. I do not feel, however, that attacks against the Ethiopian Government because of their alliance with the Soviet Union is helpful to the process of feeding starving women and children.

The United States can hopefully move forward with a full aid package to Africa in the next 2 weeks. I urge my colleagues to support a full appropriation for H.R. 1096 on Thursday. ●

FARMERS SUBMIT OPINION SURVEY TO SKELTON

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 17, 1985, I attended a farm forum sponsored by the Lafayette County Young Farmers in Higginsville, MO. Over 700 farmers, agribusiness people, and their families

packed the Higginsville High School gymnasium to discuss the worsening crisis in our Nation's agricultural economy, and to offer their views on what can be done about it.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Lafayette County Young Farmers for organizing and sponsoring this useful and informative meeting. The comments made during the open floor discussion were extremely valuable to me in assessing the depth of the financial stress currently being experienced by Missouri farmers and in formulating a proper Government response to this crisis.

In addition to the floor discussion, those in attendance were asked to fill out opinion surveys in order to express their views on various policy questions which will be before Congress when we consider the 1985 farm bill. These opinion surveys have now been tabulated, Mr. Speaker, and I insert the results in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point. All of our colleagues here in the House will benefit from knowing the views of these farmers from Missouri's Fourth Congressional District when we consider vital farm legislation this year.

The material follows:

FARM FORUM OPINION SURVEY

1. Substantial revisions in the tax code should be made—including severe limitations on farm tax shelters, deduction of farm losses from non-farm income, investment credit, and changes in depreciation schedule. Strongly Favor: 39.0%, Moderately Favor: 25.8%, No Opinion: 13.6%, Moderately Oppose: 8.4%, Strongly Oppose: 13.2%.

2. Federal farm program benefits should be denied to land newly plowed out and to highly-erodible grassland. Strongly Favor: 59.0%, Moderately Favor: 24.5%, No Opinion: 3.6%, Moderately Oppose: 6.3%, Strongly Oppose: 6.65%.

3. Some type of acreage restriction/reduction program on a voluntary basis should be included in the 1985 Farm Bill. Strongly Favor: 39.1%, Moderately Favor: 40.6%, No Opinion: 9.5%, Moderately Oppose: 4.4%, Strongly Oppose: 6.4%.

4. Soybean acreage restriction-reduction program should be included with wheat and feed grain programs. Strongly Favor: 29.6%, Moderately Favor: 35.3%, No Opinion: 13.4%, Moderately Oppose: 13.4%, Strongly Oppose: 8.4%.

5. USDA price supports should be continued. Strongly Favor: 51.6%, Moderately Favor: 30.5%, No Opinion: 7.0%, Moderately Oppose: 5.5%, Strongly Oppose: 5.5%.

6. Price support rates should be determined by cost-of-production or moving average of market price, rather than by Congress or the Secretary of Agriculture. Strongly Favor: 59.4%, Moderately Favor: 30.9%, No Opinion: 5.6%, Moderately Oppose: 2.5%, Strongly Oppose: 1.6%.

7. The farmer owned reserve program should be continued. Strongly Favor: 32.9%, Moderately Favor: 31.7%, No Opinion: 23.7%, Moderately Oppose: 6.7%, Strongly Oppose: 5.1%.

8. The current \$50,000 payment limitation per person policy should be: Lowered: 44.5%, Unchanged: 43.9%, Increased: 11.6%.

9. Crop insurance programs should be handled exclusively by private insurance

agents/companies, rather than by USDA. Strongly Favor: 39.4%, Moderately Favor: 21.9%, No Opinion: 22.2%, Moderately Oppose: 8.8%, Strongly Oppose: 7.8%.

10. Current USDA crop insurance costs should be subsidized at higher levels so premiums are lower. Strongly Favor: 31.8%, Moderately Favor: 24.5%, No Opinion: 23.5%, Moderately Oppose: 9.3%, Strongly Oppose: 10.9%.

11. FmHA foreclosure actions should be postponed until the economic conditions in agriculture improve. Strongly Favor: 41.3%, Moderately Favor: 27.2%, No Opinion: 10.3%, Moderately Oppose: 13.4%, Strongly Oppose: 7.8%.

12. Funding for USDA soil conservation cost-share assistance programs should be: Discontinued: 3.9%, Unchanged: 38.7%, Increased: 57.5%.

13. Soil erosion control technical assistance from USDA's Soil Conservation Service should be discontinued. Strongly Favor: 5.5%, Moderately Favor: 5.2%, No Opinion: 3.5%, Moderately Oppose: 18.3%, Strongly Oppose: 67.5%.

14. CCC loan rates should be 75% of the commodity's average market price during the three previous years, not a fixed rate established by the Secretary of Agriculture or Congress. Strongly Favor: 32.3%, Moderately Favor: 31.2%, No Opinion: 17.8%, Moderately Oppose: 10.1%, Strongly Oppose: 8.7%.

15. Target prices should be at 100% of the commodity's average market price during the three previous years, not at a fixed rate established by the Secretary of Agriculture or Congress. Strongly Favor: 38.2%, Moderately Favor: 33.1%, No Opinion: 13.6%, Moderately Oppose: 7.4%, Strongly Oppose: 7.7%.

16. CCC Commodity Loans should be recourse loans—meaning that they would have to be repaid, with interest, at maturity. Strongly Favor: 21.9%, Moderately Favor: 25.7%, No Opinion: 20.1%, Moderately Oppose: 14.1%, Strongly Oppose: 18.2%.

17. Producers should continue to be allowed to forfeit the grain to CCC to satisfy the loan, and interest should be waived. Strongly Favor: 34.6%, Moderately Favor: 30.9%, No Opinion: 15.2%, Moderately Oppose: 11.9%, Strongly Oppose: 7.4%.

18. Dairy price supports should not be linked to parity and should start out at \$11.60 per cwt. Strongly Favor: 8.8%, Moderately Favor: 12.6%, No Opinion: 62.1%, Moderately Oppose: 6.9%, Strongly Oppose: 9.6%.

19. The milk diversion program should be continued. Strongly Favor: 11.5%, Moderately Favor: 18.4%, No Opinion: 50.2%, Moderately Oppose: 10.3%, Strongly Oppose: 9.6%.

20. Dairy prices should be supported with government purchases of butter, cheese, and non-fat dry milk. Strongly Favor: 7.0%, Moderately Favor: 18.3%, No Opinion: 39.7%, Moderately Oppose: 18.3%, Strongly Oppose: 16.7%.

21. Land owners should be paid a price per acre to retire land from production which is less productive or erosion-prone, in a program similar to the Land Bank Program. Strongly Favor: 33.0%, Moderately Favor: 39.6%, No Opinion: 10.6%, Moderately Oppose: 9.2%, Strongly Oppose: 7.7%.

22. The land retirement program mentioned in item 21 should be granted to owners on a bid system. Strongly Favor: 13.2%, Moderately Favor: 34.3%, No Opinion: 23.2%, Moderately Oppose: 13.5%, Strongly Oppose: 15.9%.

23. Loans to assist producers develop more on-the-farm grain storage facilities should be re-activated. Strongly Favor: 24.3%, Moderately Favor: 37.8%, No Opinion: 18.4%, Moderately Oppose: 11.5%, Strongly Oppose: 7.9%.

24. USDA should set loan rates at the prevailing world market prices. Strongly Favor: 13.2%, Moderately Favor: 33.2%, No Opinion: 17.0%, Moderately Oppose: 20.3%, Strongly Oppose: 16.3%.

25. The highest deficiency payment rate should be applied to the first 100.0 acres, then reduced as acreages increase. Strongly Favor: 23.4%, Moderately Favor: 38.3%, No Opinion: 10.1%, Moderately Oppose: 16.9%, Strongly Oppose: 11.4%.

26. Farmers above a certain size should not qualify for target price protection. Strongly Favor: 22.1%, Moderately Favor: 25.9%, No Opinion: 13.3%, Moderately Oppose: 16.7%, Strongly Oppose: 22.1%.

27. The commodity loan rate for wheat should be lowered so that it is in relationship with corn rates. Strongly Favor: 4.7%, Moderately Favor: 17.7%, No Opinion: 25.3%, Moderately Oppose: 26.4%, Strongly Oppose: 26.0%.

28. CCC commodity loan programs should be dropped. Strongly Favor: 4.6%, Moderately Favor: 10.0%, No Opinion: 13.2%, Moderately Oppose: 26.1%, Strongly Oppose: 46.1%.

29. Interest reductions and principal reductions, larger than the present 25% should be made available through FmHA. Strongly Favor: 22.8%, Moderately Favor: 18.5%, No Opinion: 27.4%, Moderately Oppose: 17.2%, Strongly Oppose: 14.2%.

30. Government loan guarantees through private lenders should be offered at a lower interest rate, with the lenders having to reduce the principal as a qualifying requirement. Strongly Favor: 22.1%, Moderately Favor: 32.5%, No Opinion: 21.8%, Moderately Oppose: 12.5%, Strongly Oppose: 11.1%.

31. There should be an aggressive export program utilizing blended credit and other incentives. Strongly Favor: 65.1%, Moderately Favor: 23.9%, No Opinion: 8.3%, Moderately Oppose: 0.7%, Strongly Oppose: 2.1%.

32. Participants in Federal Farm Programs should pay a "user fee" to offset the costs of administering the programs. Strongly Favor: 9.1%, Moderately Favor: 16.7%, No Opinion: 21.6%, Moderately Oppose: 17.8%, Strongly Oppose: 34.8%.

(Due to rounding, not all percentages add up to 100.)

SOVIET JEWRY

HON. ROBERT J. MRAZEK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1985

● Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Speaker, it is often said that for every dark cloud, there is a silver lining. For Jewish people in the Soviet Union today, the opposite seems to be the case; for every silver cloud—the dream of emigrating to Israel—there is a dark lining—the Soviet Government. In the last 6 years, the world has seen the number of Jews allowed to leave Russia rapidly dwindle from a high in 1979 of 51,320 people to an abysmal 896 in 1984. Recently, and apparently

in concert with the policy of meager emigration, the Soviet Union has intensified its propaganda campaign to discredit the refusenik population.

In November 1984, a 27-minute documentary aired on Leningrad television. Titled "Hirelings and Accomplices," the show sought to equate Soviet Jews who seek to emigrate to Israel with anti-Soviet behavior. Accompanied by strains of Jewish music and footage of the Israeli-Arab military confrontation, the film attempted to unfold a Zionist conspiracy operating together with the Central Intelligence Agency and influential powerbrokers of the American Jewish community. Its commentators allege that Jews in the U.S.S.R. have been targeted for mass emigration, specifically designed to provide "cannon fodder for Israel's continuing offense against the Arab world."

It is ironic that at the most promising time in U.S.-U.S.S.R. relations in over 4 years, that the Soviet Union has chosen this time to manifest its anti-Semitic policy agenda.

Today, 3 million Jews are caught in a catch-22 of the highest order, trapped in a country that is impossible to live in—and impossible to leave. Jews who try to leave the Soviet Union face years of living in limbo. Once a Jew applies for an exit visa he is dismissed from his job, and then arrested for not having one. Even if it is possible to avoid arrest, it is impossible to avoid becoming a social outcast, and impossible to avoid the harassment and watchful eye of the KGB. Families who apply for visas together can expect cruel separation. If the Soviet Government does grant a visa, it may be only for a husband but not a wife, or only a mother but not a child.

The grim reality of Soviet life today for its Jewish citizens evokes the worst in Orwellian prophecy—1984 represented the worst year in terms of allowable emigration from the Soviet Union in nearly two decades. Coupled with the increased propaganda effort by the U.S.S.R. to discredit Jews, life in Russia has sunk to an unprecedented horrendous level. These two factors make it exceedingly clear that 1985 is not the time to relax the vigilance on these issues.

I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join in working for the freedom of all Soviet Jews. In the days and months ahead, as the United States and Soviet Union once again join in peaceful dialog, the issue of freedom for Soviet Jews must be high on the agenda. Soviet Jews ask for nothing but the opportunity to be free. As the leaders of the greatest democracy in the history of the human race, it is essential to do everything within our powers to grant them this wish. We must provide the silver lining of freedom around this ever darkening cloud of oppression. ●

CREDIT CARD SURCHARGE BAN

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, in the year ahead, the House is almost certain to debate a ban on credit card surcharges. The previous ban expired over a year ago. In the quiet before the impending lobbying blitzkrieg in favor of a new temporary, or possibly permanent ban, the following article from the Los Angeles Times is well worth reading. Its conclusion is especially noteworthy:

The whole debate is almost academic, although it keeps surfacing. In the year since the surcharge expired, virtually nobody has started the practice. And apart from gas stations, fewer than 6 percent of retailers (one estimate says 0.2 percent offer discounts. And why should they, since its entirely their choice.

I believe a credit card surcharge ban is anticonsumer. More to the point, its probably unnecessary.

I ask that the Los Angeles Times article be submitted to the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Feb. 4, 1985]

WHY DON'T CASH PAYERS GET CREDIT THEY'RE DUE?

(By S.J. Diamond)

The trouble with knowing how charge cards work—what the credit costs consumers, what the processing costs merchants—is that one senses what such systems must add to the price of goods. "Credit card services obviously cost something," complains one California shopper, "and it's obviously built into everybody's price. If I don't use that service, I should pay less than people who do."

As it happens, people, have been urging two-tiered pricing for years. Most retailers, however, see no advantage in making the change, and "third party" card issuers—banks, MasterCard, American Express, among others—actively lobby against it, given the possible decrease in card use. Unfortunately, both sides approach the issue mostly with rhetoric, with no definitive accounting of the costs of charge sales or the likely effect of changing the system.

It seems generally agreed that charge sales cost more, given both handling costs and the processing fees that merchants pay banks or card companies. Checks, too, involve both handling and risk, of course, and even "taking cash is not free," says American Express Vice President Adrienne Cleere at its Western headquarters in Torrance, what with higher security, pilferage, book-keeping. But all things considered, says Joanna Logsdon, general credit manager for Bullock's stores in California, "the cash customer is less expensive."

How much less is another question. A 1983 report from the Federal Reserve System's board of governors gave the added cost of credit card use as 2 percent or 3 percent of the purchase—an estimate seemingly confirmed by gasoline dealers, who alone have widely adopted two-tiered pricing: Many give people who pay cash a few cents off the posted price of a gallon because distributors

like Chevron charge them a 3 percent "service fee" on all credit card sales. While not claiming to be a definitive or in-depth survey, the Fed study estimated that if a third of all retail sales are charged, and the added cost of charge sales is 3 percent, one could say cash customers are subsidizing 2 cents of the extra 3 cents, or that everyone is paying 1 percent more for retail goods.

DISCOUNTS LEGAL SINCE 1974

Some argue with specific cost estimate but offer no better accounting. More argue that, whatever the cost, it is not subsidized by cash customers. The finance charges levied on a merchant's own credit-card customers mostly offset the cost of carrying house accounts, they say, and the fees given outside card-issuers are probably (but not probably) covered by the increased sales volume from card holders.

Actually, the greater debate is over how to correct the putative imbalance. Discounts for cash have been encouraged since a 1974 amendment permitting them was added to the federal truth-in-lending laws, ("Obviously, Congress bought the subsidy idea," says a government lawyer.) Another possibility is surcharges for card customers, but Congress banned surcharges in another amendment—a ban renewed twice before it expired last February.

The basic problem with surcharges is legal. "If one person buys something with cash for \$10," says a staff attorney at the Federal Reserve, "and someone else buys it with a credit card for \$12, the latter is paying \$2 for credit, and that's a finance charge." As such, it's subject to federal and state laws on disclosure and state usury laws. (A surcharge could put the total finance charge over state limits.)

Both discounts and surcharges pose practical problems, including the question of how to advertise prices at all when some people would be asked to pay more at the counter. Some say discounts could be inflationary, because merchants could raise prices in advance to diminish the effect of subsequent discounts. So could surcharges, says Meredith Fernstrom, senior vice president at American Express, because "some retailers . . . might simply add to the price for card customers without lowering that for cash customers."

Still, except for the psychological effect on consumers of paying "more than something" or paying "less," the ultimate problem is semantic. There's no real difference between adding a surcharge and offering a discount: The result is two prices, whichever is defined as "regular price," so that one can say "X cents off for cash" or "X cents more for credit."

It may be that, even if there is an imbalance in cost per customer, the imbalance doesn't really warrant righting. The cost of attracting any particular group of customers is built into prices. Doesn't everyone pay for advertising even if they don't buy the advertised goods? "Should a customer who comes to the store by bus or on foot," asked Fernstrom, "be charged a different price than one who drives and used parking facilities maintained by the stores?"

What's more, the whole debate is almost academic, although it keeps surfacing. In the year since the surcharge ban expired, virtually nobody has started the practice. And apart from gas stations, fewer than 6 percent of retailers (one estimate says 0.2 percent) offer discounts. And why should they, since it's entirely their choice? ●

H.R. 1271, SMALL CENTRAL CITIES

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] in sponsoring legislation to retain designation of Small Central Cities until the 1990 census. This designation is available to communities under the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Small Cities Community Development Programs. One of the 17 cities in danger of losing this important designation is San Benito, TX, which is in my congressional district.

I believe it is imperative that Congress pass H.R. 1271 to allow these 17 cities to retain their designation as small central cities. This means that they would continue to receive entitlement funding until the new census is completed in 1990. However, if this legislation is not enacted, the cities will lose their designation effective October 1, 1985.

Federal assistance is essential to many small communities, but especially to cities such as San Benito, TX. The economic crises of the past several years have devastated the economy and made it extremely difficult for many people to survive. The Mexican peso devaluation, the 1983 December freeze, and the 1984 floods have created severe economic repercussions for people throughout the Rio Grande Valley. San Benito Mayor Cesar Gonzalez will testify before Congress today to share with members of the Housing and Community Development Subcommittee how important these Federal funds are to small cities.

The cost of this program is quite small, but the impact is tremendous. We are talking about a mere \$8 million in a program of over \$3.4 billion. The continuation of funding for these cities has no budget impact, does not increase the Federal deficit, and provides essential services to a large population of low- and moderate-income people.

I hope that my colleagues recognize the importance of these funds to small communities around the country, but particularly to cities such as San Benito, where climactic and financial catastrophes have made it extremely difficult for the city to provide services and for the poor and low-income people to afford housing. The request for an extension of this designation until 1990 is reasonable and justifiable. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. ●

BLACK WINGS: THE AMERICAN BLACK IN AVIATION

HON. ALAN WHEAT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues an event taking place in Kansas City this weekend sponsored by the Federal Aviation Administration in conjunction with Black Archives of Mid-America, Inc., and the Kansas City Museum. "Black Wings: The American Black in Aviation" will open as a special exhibit at the Kansas City Museum and will honor those black men and women who have made so many important contributions to the development of this country's rich aviation history.

The time is long overdue for recognition and appreciation of the triumphs and tribulations of American black aviators. The sponsors of this prestigious event recognized the significant involvement of black Americans in the field of aviation and have made a commendable effort to acknowledge their accomplishments with the exhibit, "Black Wings: The American Black in Aviation."

Perhaps the history of the American black in aviation begins with Eugene Jacques Bullard, who fled the bitter segregation of the turn-of-the-century South as a very young man to the perceived equality of life in France. Gene Bullard epitomized the adventurous spirit of our American heritage, gaining acclaim as a prizefighter, band leader, French Foreign Legion infantryman, and French underground fighter. However, the greatest accolades were reserved for his accomplishments as a fighter pilot—the first black fighter pilot, though in service to a nation other than his own. Gene Bullard received a great many honors from his adopted country of France, yet eventually returned to the United States in his later years to live with his proud memories in Harlem.

Black aviators continued to make their mark on history during World War II. The 99th Fighter Squadron, later to become the 332d Fighter Group, was one of the most decorated units for bravery in combat to serve this country during that great conflict. Flying missions from Italy and North Africa, this courageous group of black pilots received 865 awards, including 95 Distinguished Crosses, and completed 1,575 missions. Among the heroes produced from this distinguished unit was its commander, Benjamin O. Davis, who would later be honored as the first black major general in the Armed Forces.

Today, pioneers such as Col. Guion S. "Guy" Bluford, who became the first black astronaut in space on August 30, 1983, and who will graciously honor us with his presence at this event, carry on with the proud tradition established by their predecessors. My sincere gratitude and that of the citizens of Kansas City are offered to the Kansas City Museum, Black Archives of Mid-America, Inc., and the Federal Aviation Administration for their efforts in bringing to us a realistic awareness of the historical presence of American blacks in yet another area vital to our Nation.●

SPEAKER ALBERT'S REMARKS

HON. WES WATKINS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, although former Speaker Carl Albert is no longer in this body, he is certainly of this body. Last Independence Day, he was principal speaker in his hometown of McAlester in the First Baptist Church, and, as always, he had wisdom to share with us. I ask leave to have his extemporaneous remarks on that occasion reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

His words follow:

Thank you, Mayor, for your introduction and thanks to all of you [the choir] who have performed so brilliantly this morning. It inspires me to see this outpouring of patriotism here in my home community. I have a feeling and have had one for some time that there is a growing resurgence of patriotism in America. We've got the troublesome and dividing years of Vietnam and the hectic years of Watergate behind us. Both of these events divided our people, but now I think across the country we see a reuniting of Americans proud of their heritage and glad that they are Americans.

On this day in 1976 I had the honor to head a large delegation of Congressmen who went to London to see the Queen, and we saw the Queen; but we went mainly to go to the Houses of Parliament and have the leading British statesmen all welcome us as brothers and friends and all saluting us as the sons of the men who in 1776, two hundred years before, has signed the Declaration of Independence.

That document has meant a lot to me in my career over the years. I well remember in the fourth grade I learned the Preamble to the Constitution of the United States and I have never forgotten it. In that same year, I learned those stirring words that Jefferson wrote that tell us what our democracy was meant to be. "We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; and that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

That, of course, is the best definition of democratic government that was ever written in the history of the world, and it is so

recognized through free nations around the world. We believe that human beings have certain rights. We believe the principal excuse for government is the preservation and the protection of those rights. We believe the only way the government will ever do that is to have the power of government vested in the hands of the people—the people take care of their own.

I have studied many times over the years the story of those men who wrote the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. They were the more elite group of government scholars ever representing any country at any time in the history of the world, and they are so recognized. A great British Prime Minister said, "they struck off in the Constitution the finest piece of work ever devised in a given time." They did it. They were a very elite group.

It is hard to believe but it is true that back then when the country was struggling, when we had little but frontiers and frontier justice, that we had probably the most intelligent group of men assembled at one time, in one place, the world has ever seen anywhere or at anytime. I am sure that this is true. They were great men. They loved their country, and of course when they signed the Declaration of Independence, they told us what we were and what we ought to be in their immortal words; but let me tell you something—and now I am harkening back to the resurgence of patriotism—let me tell you something; they didn't end the Declaration of Independence with those words. They ended it with something equally important. They ended it with the pledge that "to these ends of government we pledge our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor."

People that are not willing to work for their government and their liberty, that are not willing if need be to fight for their government and liberty are not long going to have either of them. It seems to me this is the message today: we are proud that we are Americans; We are happy that we enjoy the freedoms that are ours. This meeting today is, after two hundred and eight years, evidence of what they accomplished. It is evidence because we are here met in a peaceable assembly. This place where we meet is evidence that we still have what they are taking about and what they put in the Bill of Rights—the right to worship God according to the dictates of our own conscience and the right to freedom of speech. These are the things that make Americans what they are. They are the things that differentiate Americans from the subject races of the world. They are the things that make of America a land where all are kings, but no man dares to wear a crown.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.●

FORT VALLEY STATE COLLEGE

HON. RICHARD RAY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, this month we have been observing Black History Month around our Nation, in celebration of the contributions made by black Americans to this country.

I want to add to this commemoration, Mr. Speaker, by telling this Congress about an institution in my dis-

trict that has helped to mold and to encourage excellence among blacks. Since it was founded in 1890, the school now known as Fort Valley State College has produced men and women with a quality education and a genuine commitment to helping their local communities.

Fort Valley State College is located in the heart of Georgia, in a town that has grown up in the midst of our State's finest farmland. From the first days of its operation, it has been geared toward meeting the needs of a rural area and has given special emphasis to expanding the role of blacks in central Georgia.

Fort Valley is the only black land grant college in Georgia and received its charter in 1895 as a private elementary and secondary school. The first decade for the school was rough, since the only funding came through private contributions. But through the leadership of Henry Alexander Hunt, who served as principal from 1904 to 1938, the college quickly grew to be a junior college and then a 4-year college with special emphasis in training teachers. From its beginning days, the college aimed to educate black students for positions which would make them integral parts of the community.

By the 1950's, however, Fort Valley had assumed its rightful position as a member of the university system of Georgia. Although the school had been receiving State funds since the late 1930's, it was in the fifties that the amounts grew to levels large enough to finance new buildings on the campus.

Throughout my district and throughout the South, graduates of Fort Valley State College are expanding the reputation of the college. In almost every community in my district, there are graduates in prominent leadership roles, fulfilling one of the goals that the college instills in its graduates—community service.

The future for the college looks bright, just as its history has been impressive. Although agriculture and agricultural research is still a fundamental part of the college's curriculum, the majority of the students are receiving excellent training in the fields of business and computer science, and the college is continuing to structure its curriculum to meet the needs of tomorrow's citizens.

Since 1983, Dr. Luther Burse has served as president of Fort Valley State, and it is his goal to continue the tradition of commitment to the community that his predecessors followed. Academic excellence is the keyword for Dr. Burse, and under his leadership, I am sure it will be the hallmark of Fort Valley State College.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of Fort Valley State College and of its graduates. I can speak of their at-

tributes with a great deal of authority, for one of my staff assistants is a graduate of the school. The college has given her a genuine desire to share her talents and her abilities with her community, and it is these qualities that make her invaluable as she works with me.

Fort Valley State College is a part of the history of the Third District of Georgia and it has been a positive influence on the people and communities of my district. For that reason, I felt that this Black History Month was the appropriate time to pay tribute to the institution and to the people who have built and represent that institution. Without the contributions of Georgia's only land grant black college, our district and our State would be poorer, indeed. ●

SOLAR TAX CREDIT PHASEOUT ACT OF 1985

HON. WYCHE FOWLER, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I, along with Representatives GIBBONS, PICKLE, VANDER JAGT, CAMPBELL, JACOBS, HEFTTEL, MATSUI, DELUMS, MARTINEZ, WIRTH, GARCIA, and LUJAN, introduced legislation to extend the business and residential tax credit for solar energy installations, now scheduled to expire December 31, 1985.

Substantively, my bill would extend the residential solar credits through 1990. In order to reduce the cost to the Treasury and to provide for a gradual end to the subsidy, it provides for an annual 5-percent reduction in the credit level beginning in 1986. Because of special needs, the credit for photovoltaics would remain at 40 percent through 1990, but since over 95 percent of the solar residential applications are for heating and cooling equipment, the cost to the Treasury will be minimized. In another attempt to reduce the revenue loss, I have set a \$6,000 credit limitation on domestic hot water systems. This last provision also reflects the increasing cost competitiveness of these solar hot water systems.

Under my legislation, the solar investment tax credits would be extended at their current level of 15 percent through 1990. Because of their newness and hence need for special incentives, photovoltaics and high temperature solar industrial process heat and electricity systems would receive a 25-percent credit through 1990.

I recently received a preliminary revenue estimate from the Joint Committee on Taxation on the impact of my bill and I believe the cost-benefit ratio is a good one relative to the value we

receive as a society from solar use. In fiscal year 1986, the revenue loss would be \$25 million; in fiscal year 1987—\$255 million; in fiscal year 1988—\$270 million; in fiscal year 1989—\$230 million; and in fiscal year 1990—\$195 million. These figures all represent a substantial reduction in the cost of the credit compared to the current program.

What I am attempting to do with my legislation is to bring some stability and predictability to solar investments while at the same time providing for an orderly transition to the discipline of the marketplace. In the long run, I believe that passage of the tax credit extension will enhance our national security, create a more competitive and hence less costly energy market for consumers, and generate new revenues for the U.S. Treasury from a healthy and growing solar industry.

I hope my colleagues will join me in cosponsoring and actively supporting the extension of these solar energy credits. ●

RESTORE NIH GRANT AWARDS TO AUTHORIZED LEVEL

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disturbed by the actions of the administration to defer funds from the 1985 National Institutes of Health (NIH) budget. Congress approved 6,500 grants for biomedical research which can be awarded in 1985. At their discretion, the administration has arbitrarily reduced the number to 5,000. This deferral of NIH authorized funds blatantly violates the intention of Congress. I urge my colleagues to oppose the administration on this untimely action by cosponsoring House Joint Resolution 136, introduced by Mr. WAXMAN, to restore full funding for NIH 1986 grants.

The administration's irresponsible action will have serious short- and long-term consequences for basic biomedical research. Research laboratories and programs are making significant gains in the study of cancer, heart disease, arthritis, immunology, cell biology, molecular genetics, and neurological disorders. Research teams are painstakingly formed over a period of years. If grant money is suddenly pulled out from under them, these scientists will be forced to disband—probably never to be reassembled. Research findings would be incomplete and research continuity would be lost forever.

It is difficult enough to attract and keep medical scientists at universities to conduct basic research under NIH grant programs. Researchers and

trained technicians will leave basic science research, discouraged by declining Government support for their work. Disillusionment with Federal commitment could cause a severe "brain-drain" of competent scientists from the field of biomedical research. Future breakthroughs in life-giving medical treatments will be severely stunted, prolonging the period in which mankind must endure terminal diseases.

This Nation has always prided itself as being in the forefront of research and development in many fields of science. This abrupt, ill-conceived action by the administration deviates from this commitment and establishes a grave precedent for future research programs.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 136. I urge all my colleagues to swiftly join in this effort. This legislative measure will send a strong message to the administration that we are not satisfied with the way it has disregarded the intention of the congressionally passed National Institutes of Health authorization bill. ●

CHESTER MUCKER, LABOR LEADER OF THE YEAR

HON. RICHARD H. LEHMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 15, 1985, Chester Mucker will be honored as Labor Leader of the Year by the Central Labor Council of Fresno and Madera Counties, for his nearly 40 years of service and support to the labor movement.

Chester was born in Oklahoma in 1928. He came to Fresno, CA in 1944 and lived with his older sister, working to support his two brothers and sisters still living with his father back in Oklahoma. His father, though on an old age pension, was not able to fully support his family.

Chester spent his first year doing field work and then joined the Laborer's Local Union 294 at the age of 17. His first construction job was at the Italian Swiss Colony Winery, which is still located on Clovis Avenue. He became active in the union during the next few years, and in 1950 was elected vice president of Laborer's Local 294. He was elected its president in 1956.

While holding this position, he became a full-time representative of the union in 1958. In 1960 he was elected as a delegate to the California District Council of Laborers. He was appointed to the executive board and the negotiating committee of the northern 46 counties in 1970.

In 1978, Chester was elected to the position of business manager and secretary-treasurer of the Laborers Local 294. While holding this position, he was also elected to serve as vice president of the California Northern District Council of Laborers in 1979, and in 1983 became its president.

He is also a trustee of the Laborers Pension, Vacation, Training and Re-Training, and Health and Welfare Trust Funds for northern California. As a trustee of the fund, Chester has been instrumental in securing finances for several large construction projects in the Fresno area.

Chester has also been a delegate to various local labor groups since 1950, and takes an active interest in their activities.

Mr. Mucker was the motivating force behind the drive to build new offices for the Laborers Local 294, which are presently located at 5431 East Hedges in Fresno. Local 294 has been responsible for thousands of hours of labor being donated to many public projects in Fresno including Storyland, the Boy's Club, the Hinton Center, and Meux Home.

Chester has been married for 34 years to his wife Ella, and has five children and six grandchildren. He is an active member of the Church of the Living God.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join with the Fresno-Madera Central Labor Council in honoring my good friend Chester Mucker for his years of dedication to his fellow workers, his family, and his community.●

OUTSTANDING ATHLETE

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of our colleagues the athletic achievements of a young man from my congressional district of Pennsylvania who has amassed an outstanding record in the ranks of collegiate wrestlers.

He is 22-year-old Rick Petersen of Lock Haven University who one day may be representing our Nation in the Olympic games.

Rick was honored at Lock Haven University on February 23, prior to the start of his final collegiate meet against Cleveland State University. He has a career record of over 113 wins against only 29 losses and over half of those wins came as he pinned his opponent which is no mean feat to say the least.

This outstanding young athlete is the son of James and Janice Petersen of Renovo, PA, a small town in the north-central part of our Commonwealth where his neighbors are justifi-

ably proud of him. He twice took the championship of the Eastern Wrestling League's heavyweight division and he is a two-time Pennsylvania Conference title holder.

Rick has his sights set on the 1988 Olympic games. He stands 6 feet, 5 inches tall and weighs about 265 pounds and he would be a splendid addition to our team.

Remember his name. I'm sure will be hearing more from this outstanding young man when the Olympic trials begin.●

OPPOSITION TO ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE "CONTRAS"

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the renewal of funding for the "Contras" fighting in Nicaragua. The national interests of the United States in Central America have been discussed and debated in simplistic terms: communism versus freedom; right versus wrong; and good versus evil. In reality, the national interests of this country are tied to the complex issues of ensuring political freedom from the yoke of dictatorships of the right or left; of eliminating economic deprivation; lowering extremely high infant mortality rates, and other catastrophic health conditions; and establishing social justice.

Mr. Speaker, I too am concerned about the growing Soviet and Cuban adventurism in the Central American region. The Soviets and their surrogates have a long history of fishing in troubled waters. In the past, our response has been to utilize the arsenal of democracy to build up an infrastructure capable of rejecting the seductive appeals of Marxism.

To counter earlier Soviet fishing expeditions, the United States expended her riches on such initiatives as the Marshall Plan, the Truman Doctrine, and the Alliance for Progress. We took the high moral road and drove the Soviet fishermen out. The nations of the world applauded us.

Mr. Speaker, for some reason we have abandoned this tradition in our dealings with Nicaragua. Instead of pursuing the high moral ground, we have chosen to conduct a covert war to overthrow a government with which we have diplomatic relations. I know, our Government has stated that is not our intention. But does anyone in this Chamber really believe that our goal is other than the overthrow of the Sandinistas? If so, reread the text of the President's news conference of last Thursday.

Mr. Speaker, the peoples' body should not ratify such a rejection of

America's tradition. I call upon the administration to develop a policy which stays the course of America's heritage.●

TRIBUTE TO VICTOR POOLE

HON. RICHARD C. SHELBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, when individuals rise to certain levels of achievement within a community, they spark inspiration and respect in all who know them. Such a person lives in the seventh district of Alabama—Victor Poole of Moundville—a man of quiet determination, purpose, and generosity. Victor Poole inspires in his family, friends, business associates, and neighbors a sense of pride in their community and an appreciation of his many contributions to the State. For this I would like to thank him in a special tribute.

Victor's father, a farmer and merchant in Moundville, weathered the Depression and supported his family in one of the few jobs available. His mother devoted her working life to education—teaching school. Victor drew carefully from his parents' industrious examples and excelled in school and extracurricular endeavors as a young man.

After serving in the military with the admired 82d Airborne Infantry in the Korean war, Victor completed his formal education at the University of Alabama—graduating with a degree in commerce and business. He began his career as a young banker in the newly established Bank of Moundville and strove persistently for higher ranks within the bank. He has held the positions of vice president, executive vice president, and now chairman of the board. That once small bank boasts assets over \$23 million.

Victor's contributions to the Moundville community are many and include service as Little League president, and leadership involvement in Boy Scouts, the Black Warrior Council, town council, and the Moundville Methodist Church. He is a member of the national American Legion, the Shriners, and the Masons.

Influenced by his mother's devotion to learning, Victor has distinguished himself as a leader in efforts to upgrade the quality of education in Alabama. Victor was appointed by three different Governors to the Alabama State Board of Education and subsequently has won election to the board five consecutive times—establishing a record of 21 years of service unrivaled by only one other in the history of the board. His goals centered on upgrading the level of teacher training and enhancing students' national test scores.

It is due in great part to his efforts that Alabama now holds a greater competitive position in public education nationwide.

Victor and his wife, Madie, have three sons, all of whom have enjoyed their own measure of Poole success. Phil, the eldest, a graduate of the University of Alabama Law School and a practicing attorney in Moundville, is serving his freshman term in the Alabama House of Representatives. The Poole's second son, Howell, also graduated from the University of Alabama and now works with his father at the Bank of Moundville. Ross, the youngest, is a student at Shelton State Community College in Tuscaloosa.

Always giving of his talents, his energies, and himself, Victor Poole is a pillar of his community and a motivator in the State of Alabama. With talent and grace he has emerged as a business and education leader—respected as a model of integrity for all Alabamians to follow. I am proud to give tribute to Victor Poole and wish him and his family continued success and good health in the years ahead.●

UNIFORM GRANDPARENTS VISITATION ACT

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 67 calling on all 50 States to adopt a Uniform Grandparents Visitation Act. It is on behalf of those grandparents in this Nation who are unable to maintain visitation privileges with their grandchildren following a divorce or other form of marital dissolution between the parents of the grandchildren.

This represents a reintroduction of a virtually identical resolution which passed the House unanimously on April 19, 1983. Yet for me, it is far more than a mere reintroduction of a resolution—it is in fact the renewal of a commitment to a cause which I believe to be one of the most important issues in modern family law—preserving the important relationship between grandparents and grandchildren.

It has been said that when a child is born, a grandparent is created. Today, in this Nation, more than 75 percent of our Nation's more than 25 million people 65 and over are grandparents. We know that women become grandmothers at approximately 50 years of age while men become grandfathers at about the age of 52. Based on ever-increasing life expectancy in this Nation, this can mean that one can be a grandparent for as many as 20 to 30 years.

That is the positive side of the issue. On the downside is the fact that over

1 million children a year experience the divorce of their parents. A startling 48 percent of those who married in 1970 will eventually divorce. In 1978, 10 million children lived in a household with one natural and one stepparent.

The issue before us and the main subject of this resolution is—what rights do grandparents have to visit their grandchildren following marital dissolution due to divorce and or the death of a parent?

When I first undertook this effort in late 1982, we knew that a total of 42 States in the Nation had laws on the books providing grandparents with basic rights to petition a court when seeking visitation. Today, that number has increased to 49 States—an important development and a reflection of progress.

Yet the underlying problems that first brought this issue to my attention and which warrant my reintroduction of this resolution today still exist. My interest in this issue was sparked by a single letter from grandparents in New Jersey who advised me—*notwithstanding the existence of a law in their State—of some monumental problems they were encountering with the court system in trying to gain visitation privileges with their grandchildren.* As chairman of the House Select Committee on Aging's Subcommittee on Human Services, I began an investigation of this issue and discovered that this was not just a local problem, but rather one with national significance. At a hearing I conducted on December 16, 1982, I learned firsthand of cases involving grandparents who were forced to spend as much as \$60,000 to gain visitation privileges in one State only to have the children moved to another State.

Following this hearing, I introduced in the 98th Congress House Concurrent Resolution 45 which did pass the House unanimously on April 19. A similar Senate resolution failed to gain final action before adjournment and thus we are forced to start the issue again.

My resolution expresses the sense of the Congress that a uniform State act should be developed and adopted "which provides grandparents with adequate rights to petition State courts for privileges to visit their grandchildren following the dissolution (because of divorce, separation or death) of the marriage of such grandchildren's parents."

The critical issue involved in this resolution is its call for a uniform State act to be developed and passed by all 50 States relative to grandparent visitation. Traditionally, under common law and until recently under the laws of nearly every State, a grandparent had no greater right of access to his or her grandchild that

did a nonrelative. This right of access was controlled by the natural parent even to the extent that following a marital dissolution, the right to grant or prohibit grandparent visitation passed to the custodial or sole living parent.

In recent years, States have developed laws providing basic rights of grandparents to petition State courts for visitation. However in an analysis prepared for me by Rita Ann Reimer, legislative attorney at the American Law Division of the Library of Congress, we find the conditions under which a grandparent can petition a court vary from State law to State law. As she observes,

Statutes covering the same general categories may also differ among themselves. For example, certain States limit the right to petition for visitation rights following a marriage dissolution to the parents of the noncustodial parent while others refer generally to grandparents without further elaboration.

My resolution seeks to build upon the foundation of the 49 existing State laws and develop a structure of uniformity for all State laws on behalf of grandparent visitation. Let me quote directly from the text of the resolution:

That (a) it is the sense of the Congress that the States should develop and adopt a model act which—

(1) provides grandparents with adequate rights to petition State court for, and to be fully heard in such courts with respect to the granting of, privileges to visit such grandparents' grandchildren after the dissolution (because of divorce, separation or death) of the marriage of such grandchildren's parents

(2) ensures that such rights extend to cases in which, after such dissolution, such parents remarry and stepparents adopt such grandchildren; and

(3) establishes procedures for the interstate recognition and enforcement of State court orders granting such visitation privileges.

The resolution calls upon the Secretary of Health and Human Services through the National Center for Child Abuse and Neglect and the Administration on Aging to provide "technical assistance to States, in developing publishing and disseminating guidelines" which can be used in the development of the uniform State law.

The resolution reiterates and stresses that grandparent visitation should be granted by States only when it is in the best interest of the child. That is the prevailing sentiment in the existing State laws, and I see that any Federal position on grandparent visitation should respect that important principle. Further, the resolution calls for proper recognition to be accorded to the ability of grandparents to help satisfy such child's need for continuity of care after the dissolution of a marriage.

As I did when I first developed this resolution in 1983, I offer it with full recognition that, according to Ms. Reimer,

Congress has no general authority to legislate on family law questions. * * * However, there are some indirect approaches which might be utilized to obtain the desired result. There have been occasional "sense of the Congress" resolutions introduced on domestic relations topics. These have no legally binding force or effect but are introduced in the hope that if Congress goes on record as favoring a certain policy, the individual States will be encouraged to adopt legislation advancing that policy.

I offer this resolution under a slightly different context. State laws do exist—there is only the need to make them more uniform. That is the sentiment expressed in this resolution.

Throughout my 2½-year-long effort on this, I have been assisted by a small but very effective network of advocates for grandparents' rights—including those who themselves are grandparents. The most consistent and effective advocates for grandparent visitation rights in this Nation are a wonderful couple from the small town of Haslett, MI, Lee and Lucille Sumpter, founders and leaders of Grandparents Children's Rights Inc. In addition, the work of Dr. Arthur Kornhaber, of the Foundation for Grandparenting in New York, I would like to note at this point. His work, including his book, "Grandparents—Grandchildren—the Vital Connection," has proven to be most helpful in my work. Finally but not least is the work of Ms. Gerrie Hight of Baltimore, MD, who has also served to provide me with important assistance in this endeavor.

I believe the issues involved in the resolution have many dimensions, but in my mind the one issue is the personal one. I happen to be a grandparent six times over and that is a great source of joy to me. I am fortunate enough to have full visitation privileges with my grandchildren and realize how painful it would be if I were to lose it. Yet for many grandparents, that is the trauma they face and from my perspective, this issue should be addressed.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in this effort to preserve the important relationship between grandparents and grandchildren. This is a resolution that is a product of extensive and careful research including two hearings that I conducted. Its support was already registered by the House in 1983 which, in my mind, demonstrates that the cause is just. Yet we approach this issue from the standpoint of what is in the best interests of both the grandchildren and the grandparent, with proper emphasis placed on the grandchild.

At this point in the RECORD, I wish to insert the full text of my resolution and urge my colleagues to join as co-sponsors. In the ensuing days and

weeks, I will be placing into the RECORD, letters from grandparents dramatizing the situation which this resolution seeks to address.

H. CON. RES. 67

Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that a uniform State act should be developed and adopted which provides grandparents with adequate rights to petition State courts for privileges to visit their grandchildren following the dissolution (because of divorce, separation, or death) of the marriage of such grandchildren's parents, and for other purposes

Whereas approximately 75 per centum of all older Americans are grandparents;

Whereas grandparents play a vital role in millions of American families;

Whereas an estimated one million children a year experience the divorce of their parents;

Whereas the laws of forty-nine States (1) provide grandparents with certain rights to petition State courts for privileges to visit their grandchildren after the dissolution (because of divorce, separation, or death) of the marriage of such grandchildren's parents, and (2) allow such courts to grant such visitation privileges if such courts consider it in the best interests of such grandchildren;

Whereas such procedural rights to petition State courts often do not provide grandparents with adequate opportunities to be fully heard with respect to the granting of such visitation privileges;

Whereas the factors considered by State courts in determining whether the granting of such visitation privileges is in the best interests of the children involved varies widely among such States;

Whereas the ability of grandparents who have meaningful relationships with their grandchildren before the dissolution (because of divorce, separation, or death) of the marriage of such grandchildren's parents to help satisfy such grandchildren's needs for continuity of care and familial ties after such dissolution is often not fully taken into account in determining the best interests of such grandchildren;

Whereas the lack of uniformity among the laws of States with respect to such visitation privileges adversely affects the ability of grandparents to enforce and exercise such visitation privileges once granted by a court because of the interstate movement of the parties involved; and

Whereas national grandparents' rights organizations have been established for the purpose of focusing national, State, and local attention on the issue of grandparents' visitation rights: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (a) it is the sense of the Congress that the States should develop and adopt a model act which—

(1) provides grandparents with adequate rights to petition State courts for, and to be fully heard in such courts with respect to the granting of, privileges to visit such grandparents' grandchildren after the dissolution (because of divorce, separation, or death) of the marriage of such grandchildren's parents;

(2) ensures that such rights extend to cases in which, after such dissolution, such parents remarry and stepparents adopt such grandchildren; and

(3) establishes procedures for the interstate recognition and enforcement of State

court orders granting such visitation privileges.

(b) It is the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of Health and Human Services, through the National Center for Child Abuse and Neglect and the Administration on Aging, should provide technical assistance to States in developing, publishing, and disseminating guidelines which—

(1) may be used in determining the "best interest of the child" in cases in which the grandparents of such child seek privileges to visit such child after the dissolution (because of divorce, separation, or death) of the marriage of such child's parents, including cases in which such privileges are sought in situations described in subsection (a)(2); and

(2) take into account the ability of grandparents to help satisfy such child's need for continuity of care after such dissolution.●

RESOLUTION ON DEDUCTIONS FOR CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be joined by Mr. FRENZEL and Mr. TAUZIN in introducing a resolution which calls for the preservation of the current tax incentives for charitable contributions.

The Department of Treasury's tax reform plan proposes three changes in the Tax Code which could destroy the funding base of charitable organizations. First, above the line deductions for taxpayers who do not itemize their returns would be abolished. This change would affect almost 64 percent of all taxpayers.

Second, the proposal would abolish deductions for all charitable contributions below 2 percent of adjusted gross income. A family with an income of \$25,000 a year, for example, could only deduct the amount of charitable contributions which exceed \$500 per year. Currently, the average deduction for charity taken by those who itemize their returns is 1.97 percent of adjusted gross income.

Finally, contributors of real estate, stocks, or merchandise could not deduct more than the original purchase price indexed for inflation of the item donated.

These changes in our laws would cost charities an estimated \$10 to \$12 billion a year. They would have a devastating effect on the ability of charities to operate, particularly as they are burdened with increasingly heavy responsibilities to compensate for drastic reductions in Federal funds for social programs.

The Treasury Department's proposed changes for deductions in charitable contributions would not diminish the generosity of Americans, whose spirit of good will and human compas-

sion is deeply rooted in our values. The tremendous outpouring of private charitable contributions demonstrates the fervor with which Americans support the activities of the American Red Cross, the American Cancer Society, the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, the United Way, and the thousands of other philanthropic organizations to which they give. The changes would, however, hamper their ability to give. And, ironically, they would force charities to rely greater on the Federal Government for the resources they need to properly function.

I urge all my colleagues to join with me in supporting this resolution.●

TOBACCO DEREGULATION ACT

HON. THOMAS E. PETRI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing the Tobacco Deregulation Act of 1985. It is time to put the tobacco program out of its misery. In the first place, it makes no sense to warn people about the hazards of smoking on one hand and subsidize tobacco on the other. But beyond that, the program is slowly strangling our domestic tobacco industry and ruining hard working family tobacco farmers. While taxpayer subsidies persist on the order of \$100 million per year, and tobacco loan stocks mount, our imports of tobacco are zooming, exports are dropping, total domestic production has plummeted, and farmers' profits are soaked up by a largely absentee class of landlords who own the Government granted rights to market this crop. Here today we have a group of farmers who want nothing from the Government except to get it off their backs. In this year of concern over the budget deficit, the trade deficit, and the farm crisis, there can be no better place to start putting our house in order than right here. One is led to ask, "If not here, where? If not now, when?"

Very simply, the benefits of the tobacco program do not go to the actual farmers. They go to allotment owners, most of whom lease or rent their tobacco rights to farmers at rates which absorb all the profit. The situation is worst in Flue-cured tobacco, which is 55 percent of all domestic tobacco, but it is similar in burley, which is 37 percent of the crop. About 83 percent of Flue-cured allotment owners grow no tobacco at all, and nationwide allotment rents total \$800 million per year according to one recent study. The system is feudalistic. This is a free country. No farmer should have to pay some investor for the right to grow a crop.

Some of you may wonder why health groups and tobacco farmers are on the same side in this fight. I think I can explain it quite easily. Health groups want a consistent Government policy and elimination of the huge financial interest of the allotment owners, who number over half a million and provide the main political constituency for prosmoking efforts. Tobacco farmers would like to produce as much tobacco as possible and receive all the profit from their production. To the extent that antismoking efforts succeed, U.S. cigarette consumption may gradually decline, but there is clearly going to be a large world market for tobacco for many years. The farmers' overwhelming interest is to reclaim their historic share of that world market and to get the allotment owners off their backs. In other words, whatever tobacco is produced we want to produce here. We have got to free our farmers to compete in the world market. A recent study at North Carolina State University concluded that tobacco deregulation would result in a doubling of our tobacco exports, a virtual elimination of imports, and an increase in the total demand for U.S. tobacco of 50 to 100 percent or more.

Some of you may also be under the impression that the tobacco program has been operating at "no net cost" to the taxpayers since 1982. I am afraid that is just not true. Besides the small administrative costs of \$15 million per year, the program does not compound interest on the money used to finance tobacco under loan. This procedure understates the true cost to the taxpayers of providing that money. The most recent GAO report on tobacco gave two estimates of the amount of this understated interest on just the 1982 Flue-cured crop. The lower estimate, from the people who run the program, the ASCS Tobacco and Peanuts Division, was \$50 million over the life of that crop. The higher estimate, from the Department of Agriculture Inspector General's Office, was \$164 million. Since there are similar costs for the burley tobacco under loan, it is clear that the annual costs for understated interest are at least on the order of \$100 million. Besides that, the assessments on growers have never come close to covering even the costs that are officially ascribed to the program, so assessments are constantly being raised in an effort to catch up. This year the Flue-cured assessment may well rise from 7 cents to 25 cents per pound, but even with that it is not clear that we will ever recover all the official costs. It seems to me we've been gambling and consistently losing, and it's time to cut our losses and get out.

I know there are some organizations that would prefer a phaseout of the program rather than an abrupt termi-

nation. I am sympathetic to their concerns and more than willing to work with them and consider any proposal. Of course, any such proposal has to be germane as an amendment to the 1985 farm bill on the House floor; that is, it can't involve changing or using cigarette excise taxes. In addition, it has to be fair to family tobacco farmers, and I don't think it's fair to continue their bondage to allotment holders any longer. When all is said and done, I personally feel that immediate deregulation will appear as the best, and long overdue, solution.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday, February 24, marked the 67th anniversary of Estonian Independence Day. The Estonian people enjoyed freedom, cultural growth, and economic prosperity until 1940 when their independence was crushed by a brutal invasion and occupation by Soviet troops. That occupation continues to this day, almost half a century later. To this day, we can be extremely proud that the United States has refused to recognize the Soviet claim to once-free Estonia and her neighboring Baltic States of Lithuania and Latvia. The Soviet occupation is illegal. No matter how oppressive their tyranny by force may be, they will not be able to break the national will of the Estonian people to determine their own future. Until the day comes when Estonia can reassume her rightful place in the community of free nations, the brave people of Estonia can be confident that we will not rest in our efforts to support their sacred struggle to be free. We will never be silent, but will protest vehemently every Soviet abuse of Estonian national and human rights.●

TRIBUTE TO TRUMAN J. NEWHART

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Mr. Truman J. Newhart, a resident of northeastern Pennsylvania, who is retiring after more than 42 years of service to our Nation, both as a soldier and a civilian and both here and abroad.

Mr. Newhart is leaving his post as personnel officer at Tobyhanna Army Depot, a job he has held since 1959

with the exception of a 3-year assignment in Europe.

Prior to 1959, Mr. Newhart held many important personnel management positions in Europe, including service as a civilian personnel officer in Germany for a number of years. During his active and reserve military career, Mr. Newhart attained the rank of colonel.

Mr. Newhart has been very active in his community and has worked for many years with the Boy Scouts and Rotary International. He has also served on a number of boards and committees of professional organizations and community service groups.

He has been recognized on a number of occasions for his contributions to the Federal Government. His latest honor was receipt of a Commander's Award for Exceptional Civilian Service and a Significant Accomplishment Merit Pay Award.

Mr. Newhart's fellow workers, officials of Tobyhanna Army Depot and his many friends will gather to honor him March 9 with a testimonial dinner at Pocono Manor, PA.

He and his wife, Nina, are the parents to two sons and a daughter. The couple met in Europe following World War II after Mrs. Newhart had escaped the clutches of the Nazis in her native Poland.

Over the years, Mr. Newhart has often worked with my office for the benefit of Tobyhanna Army Depot and the people of northeastern Pennsylvania. We owe him a debt of gratitude. ●

TRIBUTE TO JAMES P. MADDEN

HON. EDWARD F. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join with me in paying tribute to James P. Madden, a fine public official who is being honored today by the Cuyahoga County, OH, Bar Association at its 39th Annual Public Servants Merit Awards Luncheon.

Over 34 years of experience in Cuyahoga County's court system is but one of the achievements that Mr. Madden can boast of to qualify him as a recipient of the Bar Association's Certificate of Merit. Mr. Madden has excelled in a variety of positions in the public realm beginning as a deputy clerk of courts in 1951. Today, he serves as jury commissioner of Cuyahoga County, overseeing the jury selection process and its administration for our courts.

Throughout the years, Mr. Madden has become somewhat of a "goodwill ambassador" for the courts and their functions. He has proven to be a valuable resource to citizens, young attor-

neys, and even fellow employees who find that the halls of the justice center are not the most hospitable locale to conduct their business. In addition, many groups in the community are made aware of the process of jury service through Mr. Madden's rigorous lecture schedule.

In previous years, Mr. Madden has maintained a high level of interest in local Democratic Party politics. He is a former vice-chairman of the Cuyahoga County Democratic Executive Committee and still holds a membership on that body. For years he led the Democratic Party in the city of Lakewood, OH. Lifelong residents of the Greater Cleveland area, both Mr. Madden and his wife Margaret have raised four children, two of whom have chosen public service careers.

It is not every day that members of the frequently maligned public sector are singled out for recognition of a job well done. Today, it is my honor to join with my colleagues and the Cuyahoga County Bar Association in saluting James P. Madden, an individual who personifies the ideals of public service. ●

114TH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF PRINCE KALANIANA'OLE

HON. CECIL (CEC) HEFTTEL

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, March 26, 1985, marks the 114th anniversary of the birth of Prince Johah Kuhio Kalaniana'ole, Hawaii's delegate to Congress from 1903 until his death in 1922. I am pleased to recognize this great Hawaiian leader and his lasting accomplishments.

Prince Kuhio was a full-blooded Hawaiian of royal lineage. Were it not for the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy in 1893, he might have become king. For a time, he refused to recognize the newly formed Republic of Hawaii. However, his deep commitment to the people of Hawaii, coupled with his recognition that their interests could best be served by accepting the new political order, led Kuhio to take his part in public affairs as a loyal American citizen.

Within the local political parties, he fought for democratic practices. Within the community, he reminded islanders of their good fortune in being citizens of the United States. In 1902, he ran for delegate to Congress. In this and nine subsequent elections, the people of Hawaii elected him as their representative.

During his 19 years in this body, Prince Kuhio's determined efforts produced lasting accomplishments for all the people of Hawaii, particularly those of native blood. Years of foreign

immigration and domination had a telling effect on Hawaii's original inhabitants. To his colleagues in Congress, Kuhio expressed his anxiety over the diminishing population of the Hawaiian race and the loss of their lands. The result was the establishment in 1921 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission, which continues to lease certain lands as homesteads to native Hawaiians at a nominal fee.

Kuhio formed the Hawaiian Civic Clubs in 1917 to encourage involvement in community affairs among his people. These clubs, like the Hawaiian Homes Commission, are still active today, keeping the memory of Hawaii's beloved Prince alive.

Prince Kuhio lived during a period of monumental change in Hawaiian society from monarchy to territory. His pragmatic leadership helped the people of Hawaii move forward successfully as proud American citizens.

I am honored to pay tribute to this great man. As the 114th anniversary of his birth nears, let us remember the statesmanship and dedication to his constituents exemplified by Hawaii's second delegate to Congress, Prince Johah Kuhio Kalaniana'ole. ●

CLOSING A DANGEROUS LOOPHOLE IN SUPERFUND

HON. JIM MOODY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing my bill which would handle a glaring omission in present practice of Superfund implementation by EPA. There are 519 uncontrolled hazardous waste sites in this country which are not monitored by the EPA. These sites are located in every State and in 275 congressional districts.

What makes these sites different from other hazardous waste sites? All of these sites are owned or operated by the Federal Government. Although Superfund and other pollution control laws require uniform compliance by federally and privately owned facilities, it is a little known fact that procedural noncompliance by Federal sites is rampant—the rule rather than the exception. In effect, Federal facilities are omitted from compliance.

Federal agencies knowingly disregard the intent of Superfund through their use of Memoranda of Understanding. The Department of Justice and EPA have a longstanding blanket policy of never taking court action against noncomplying Federal agencies. Agencies maintaining polluting facilities have no incentive to rectify deficiencies or to negotiate seriously because regulatory authorities have rendered themselves powerless to compel compliance by administrative

or judicial action. For example, EPA and the Department of Defense have a Memorandum of Understanding releasing EPA from cleanup responsibility for hazardous releases on DOD sites.

The danger potential of these Federal hazardous waste sites is mounting as delays in cleanup continue. In 1982, a contractor—Risk Science International [RSI]—for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce attempted to compare the hazard potentials of certain DOD sites to those of the most hazardous private sites on the national priorities list. RSI calibrated the Air Force's site scoring protocol against the MITRE protocol—the hazard ranking system used by EPA for private sites—and then estimated the scores and ranks that the Air Force's top 100 sites of concern might get under the MITRE scoring. This analysis concluded that all 100 of the Air Force's top 100 sites would have scored above the NPL cutoff score and thus would have merited inclusion on the NPL. Thirty-three of the Air Force's top 100 sites, located at 9 separate Air Force installations in 8 States, would have been included among the top NPL sites.

While the level of danger at these Federal facilities has been established, the enormity of this fact is compounded by the sheer number of Federal hazardous waste sites. As previously mentioned, there are 519 Federal installations. However, there are probably at least 1,100 to 1,400 individual Federal facility hazardous waste sites at the 519 Federal installations. These numbers are derived as follows: There is an average of 2.5 to 3 hazardous waste sites per DOD installation, at best, a conservative estimate by the DOD; DOD installations constitute 80 percent of those Federal installations; and assume 1 site per non-DOD Federal installation.

In conclusion, the goal of this legislation is to treat Federal hazardous waste sites equally with privately owned sites and to establish a process to ensure effective compliance by Federal sites with Superfund.

My bill will complement and enhance the reauthorization of Superfund by specifically closing a dangerous loophole that allows the exemption of federally owned or operated hazardous waste sites from compliance under the same standards experienced by private industry.●

DEAN MCKEE HONORED

HON. JOHN McCAIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. McCAIN. Mr. Speaker, many Americans have served nobly in defense of our Nation, receiving little

praise but deriving great satisfaction from having done something for their fellow Americans. Today I would like to ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to such a person, a man who has upheld the highest standards in his efforts in the military and on behalf of veterans nationwide.

Dean McKee, currently the Regional Manager of the Veterans Center Program in Providence, RI, has an exemplary military career. A veteran of over 15 years, he has 244 combat sorties and has received 14 decorations, including the Distinguished Flying Cross.

A medical disability forced Dean to retire from the Air Force, but it did not slow his accomplishments. He was the team technician in the Phoenix, AZ Vet Center from its inception in 1979 to 1981. He then accepted the position as team leader of the Vet Center in Tucson, thus improving both the extent and quality of veterans service available statewide.

Dean's life has been characterized by his compassion for others, most notably the many men and women who have served in our Armed Forces. His hard work and integrity make him an example for us all.

De Toqueville once said that the only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men and women to do nothing. I have no fear for the future of America as long as there are outstanding people like Dean McKee in our midst.●

IN HONOR OF JUDGE JOHN R. SPON

HON. DOUGLAS APPELATE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. APPELATE. Mr. Speaker, recently, Judge John R. Spon retired from the probate and juvenile court of Jefferson County, OH, after many years of dedicated and outstanding service to his community.

Judge Spon, a life-long resident of Steubenville, graduated from Ohio Northern University in 1942, followed immediately by his service in World War II with the U.S. Navy, serving for nearly 3½ years and achieving the rank of lieutenant commander. John returned to his native Steubenville after the war and went on to serve in the office of the prosecuting attorney in Jefferson County, working for nearly a decade under attorneys Bernard T. McCann and Joseph Loha. In August of 1961, John was appointed by then Ohio Gov. Michael DiSalle to fill the unexpired term of the late Emmett M. Morrow as judge of the probate and juvenile courts. It has been in this position that Judge John R. Spon has served his community,

bringing the utmost in distinguished judgment and leadership throughout this time that has spanned nearly a quarter century.

Judge Spon and his gracious wife Dorothy, both personal friends, have contributed immensely to Steubenville and Jefferson County.

John has served as a member of the Jefferson County Children Services Board, the Jefferson County Drug and Alcohol Abuse Center, the Jefferson County Mental Health Center, and the Young Men's Christian Association. Along with these distinctions, John has also served as president of the Jefferson County Humane Society, the Steubenville Little League, the Babe Ruth League, and the Steubenville High School Parent Teachers Association. He is also one of the directors of the local chapter of the Full Gospel Businessman's Fellowship International. As well, I might also add that John is an avid ham radio enthusiast.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of the 18th District of Ohio, I would like to convey to Judge John R. Spon our highest regards and respect for the service that he has rendered to our community. John has given to us through his experience on the court the ideals of fairness and understanding that will be sorely missed in Steubenville and Jefferson County following his retirement. I wish Judge John R. Spon and Dorothy the very best as he departs the bench and starts his journey into a well-deserved and wonderful retirement.●

AMERICA'S TRADE SITUATION WITH JAPAN

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to share with my colleagues a copy of my weekly column dealing with America's trade situation with Japan because of the seriousness of this problem.

HEY TOKYO, WE'RE FRIENDS

We should have seen the upcoming trouble with the softball bat incident.

For many years the Japanese Government refused to allow import of the new U.S. metal softball bats. From that point a pattern developed of disregard for the American economy that has placed Japanese-American relations on the brink of a major showdown.

We confront a fierce trade war with Japan:

Japanese steel imports to the U.S. were up 72.2 percent in December from a month earlier, 12.6 percent over a year earlier; and up 39.5 percent for the year.

Recent decisions by the Japanese Government effectively froze U.S. telephone and telecommunications equipment out of a Jap-

anese market that could be worth \$10 billion to the United States.

An American cabinet level council recommended to the President that the voluntary limit of 1.85 million Japanese cars sold in the United States be removed, a step the United Auto Workers say would threaten 200,000 American jobs, and

Japan decided recently to require new testing of American vitamin E face cream and other vitamin E products, testing not required of Japanese products, and a move which effectively puts the United States out of this \$40 million-a-year Japanese business.

Let me make a few observations about the impact of these consistent decisions ranging from large to small trade items.

First, they indicate an American trade deficit problem almost as serious as our budget deficit. We spent \$120 billion more for foreign goods last year than we sold to foreigners. For the first time in our history we owe more abroad than foreigners owe us. The trade gap has closed American factories, displaced an estimated 2 million workers from their jobs, and kept interest rates high. The trade gap with Japan alone is \$37 billion.

Second, this has gone beyond any type of "free-trade" debate. I join virtually every American in philosophically supporting "free trade" with the market going to the best and the most economical. But in a world practicing barriers like the Japanese, the U.S. faces a choice of joining the war and requiring fairness or seeing more of its jobs and industries slip away.

Third, it is an extremely ironic situation: our economy is being attacked not by our Communist military enemies, but by our military allies, our friends. The entire Western/free world alliance is tied together economically as well as militarily. We gain nothing if one of those countries becomes indefensible militarily; equally we lose ground if the partners are damaging one another so severely economically as to undermine economic strength.

If we were to erect a system of trade barriers, fees, tests, etc. that undermined Japan's economy, we would be equally at fault. The United States must take the lead in forcing a new era of modern trade among the U.S. allies to bring some order, reasonableness and fairness to everybody's trade policies.

We are friends. Let's start acting like it. ●

OPPOSITION TO DEREGIONALIZATION OF FEDERAL REGIONAL OFFICES

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● **Mr. MARKEY.** Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

STATEMENT OF HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for holding a hearing concerning President Reagan's proposed consolidation of the regional Federal offices from the present number of 10 to a total number of 7. This proposal would include the consolidation of the Boston regional office that serves the people and States of the New England area with the New York office. That this consolidation is meant to take place in the interest of cutting costs from the Federal budget is

laudable. That it is meant to take place without serious ramifications to the quality and availability of the services these offices provide to the people and States of the New England region is ludicrous.

There are two equally important issues at stake here. Services to citizens are going to be reduced due to fewer and more inaccessible Federal office field representatives. The consolidation of the two offices in New York will mean a net loss of several hundred jobs to people in the greater Boston area. These effects would cause significant hardship on the people of New England.

No one can dispute the fact that Boston is the geographic, economic, and governmental center of New England. To eliminate these jobs from the New England job market would be devastating for a number of reasons. The proposal eliminates approximately one-third of the Boston jobs with the remaining jobs being transferred to the office in New York. Consequently, the President is asking New York office personnel to serve and aid the people in New England. I cast no aspersions on the quality of service offered by the people of New York, but I feel very strongly that the people of New England would be better served by a local office.

The New York Regional Office now serves approximately 10 million people. The Boston Regional Office serves approximately 6 million people. The proposed consolidation of these offices would cause two distinct problems. The combined pool of 16 million people would be served by a regional office staff that would be cut by 11 percent. Six million of these people would be served by an office that would no longer be readily accessible. People who require the services of the regional federal offices are best served by swift action and easy access. People in need should not have to travel long distances to stand in line for government services.

Apparently, this administration feels that a reduction in services that will result in budgetary savings in 3 to 5 years is the way to solve the deficit problem that plagues us right now. This proposed deregionalization of federal offices is indicative of the wrong emphasis this administration is placing in its efforts to balance the burgeoning Federal budget.

This questionable logic brings us to yet another problem with the proposed consolidation of regional federal offices. Would this effort really save money? The merger of the Boston office to the New York office would result in greatly increased costs to examine program implementation and travel within the region. What was once a 3- to 5-hour drive, would become 1- to 2-day trip. These increased expenditures could easily equal or outweigh any potential gains.

Clearly, the costs of consolidating the Boston and New York federal offices would be extremely high in terms of dollars spent and services surrendered. The proposed deregionalization of the federal regional offices would increase government expenditures with reduced access and efficiency, and the public interest would not be served. We must think very seriously before we approve such an ill-considered proposal. Historically, emotionally, geographically, and economically, Boston has served as the center of New England. To close the federal offices in Boston that serve the New England region would do Boston and the region a grave disservice. I must go on record as wholly opposing this initiative.

Thank you for including this statement as part of the hearing record. ●

IRS COMMISSIONER MAKES GREAT CASE FOR MASSIVE TAX REFORM

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● **Mr. STARK.** Mr. Speaker, every time he gives an interview, the President backs further away from the Treasury Department's outstanding work on tax reform. The concrete work of the Treasury's experts is rapidly turning to jello in the President's mouth.

Still, the people who really know taxes—such as IRS Commissioner Egger—continue to make the good fight as to why, without tax reform, our tax system could collapse. I would like to include at this point in the RECORD an excellent article by Commissioner Egger from the Washington Post of February 10, 1985:

WITHOUT REAL REFORM, OUR TAX SYSTEM COULD COLLAPSE

(By Roscoe L. Egger, Jr.)

In his State of the Union address President Reagan made a persuasive case for tax reform to achieve "fairness, simplification and growth." In addition, there is a factor that is of particular concern in my business of tax collecting: if we fail to make our tax code simpler and fairer in the near future, we could jeopardize a great American tradition—voluntary compliance with the tax laws.

Fundamental tax reform is now not a luxury. It is a stark necessity if we are to preserve that tradition of voluntary compliance. The latest figures we have are for 1981, when Americans failed to pay \$90 billion in taxes they owed to the government. The size of this "tax gap" has probably grown in the last four years, and it is part of our deficit problem.

Now all tax avoidance can be described as cheating, because—unfortunately—a lot of it is legal. In the last few years there has been a staggering growth in the ways taxpayers have attempted to avoid taxes by investing in so-called shelters. Tax shelters are "exhibit A" when it comes to demonstrating the unfairness of our current tax system. They are also evidence of the tax lengths to which some taxpayers will go to avoid paying taxes—a sign, perhaps, of how close we are getting to a society in which dodging taxes becomes not only fashionable, but acceptable.

Some recent data on tax returns of selected partnerships is instructive, since partnerships are a common vehicle used for tax shelters. Between 1963 and 1982 the number of taxpayers who claimed partnership losses on their individual returns increased from 412,000 to about 2.1 million. At the same time there has been a significant erosion in the base of the federal income tax—that is, the amount of taxable, reported income—particularly among taxpayers in the higher income groups.

In 1983, partnership losses that were claimed by individual taxpayers sheltered as much as \$35 billion dollars of income that would otherwise have been taxed. A sampling of 88 Form 1040 returns gives an illus-

tration of how this works in individual cases.

These taxpayers held interests in certain tax shelters that are not being challenged by the Internal Revenue Service as abusive. The average income of this group was \$193,000, and their total income before losses was \$17 million. But their taxable income was just \$1.9 million, because they deducted losses of \$6.4 million from partnerships, and other losses totaling \$8.7 million.

Of these 88 returns, 19 with average gross income before losses of more than \$240,000 reported total income tax payments of less than \$500. Thirty-seven with average gross income before loss of more than \$170,000 reported total tax payments of \$6,000 or less.

To compare, a typical family of four with income of \$45,000 and no tax shelter losses would pay \$6,272 in taxes. The current tax system in this country supports this kind of gross unfairness. It reinforces the notion that there are special privileges—but only for the few that somehow find ways to take advantage of the system.

Last year, the IRS commissioned a detailed study of public attitudes to the tax laws. The firm of Yankelovich, Skelly and White interviewed more than 2,000 people, and confirmed that most taxpayers consider the system unfair.

At least 75 percent of taxpayers believe their taxes are too high for what they get, and about two out of three believe they have to pay more than their fair share. A whopping 80 percent of the taxpayers in this country believe the present system benefits the rich and is unfair to the ordinary working man or woman.

Can we afford any longer a system whose very unfairness and complexity literally invites tax cheating? Can we support a system where special interests get a variety of tax breaks but the great majority of the people are squeezed just a bit harder each year to make up the difference?

The answer is obvious. Our survey of 2,000 taxpayers produced strong evidence of increasing public cynicism about taxes. Half the population thinks that 25 percent or more of all Americans cheat on taxes; a quarter of the population thinks more than half of us cheat. A majority said tax cheating is increasing. Nineteen percent of those we surveyed admitted cheating on their own taxes. What is the reason for this cheating? The answer given most often in our survey was that the existing system is unfair.

In our sample 38 percent of those questioned agreed with this statement: "Since a lot of rich people pay no taxes at all, if someone like me underpays a little, it's no big deal."

The reaction to the Treasury Department's new and admirable tax simplification package was a case study in what's wrong with our current system. One after another, the special interests have come forward to attack the Treasury plan.

Why? Because regardless of a general lowering of the rate structure to the benefit of the many, the few that have benefited in the past want their special tax breaks to continue. Never mind that they would receive the overall benefits of the reforms. The few also want to continue to receive their preferential treatments. But the very existence of all those special privileges is exactly why we need to reform the system—not later, but now.

For a quarter century we have been using the tax code to provide incentives for social and economic objectives deemed desirable by Congress. As a result we have a system

piled high with patchwork complexities resulting from one so-called reform after another. For example, last year's "reform" effort amounted to more than 1,000 pages of legislative language and was designed to "fix" some of the difficulties of the system.

One of the greatest potential benefits of the Treasury Department's new proposals has gotten too little attention: the prospect of abolishing tax returns for most American taxpayers.

This isn't a pipe dream. About 90 percent of the wage earners in Japan don't have to file tax forms. In Britain, too, most wage earners are usually spared the need to file any forms. We could also develop a return-free program if we had a simplified tax code.

Beginning with the 1987 tax year, we could help 14 million people earning less than \$50,000 a year pay their taxes without filing any forms. These taxpayers now file our shortest and simplest tax form, the 1040EZ. By 1990, we believe the program could reach as many as two-thirds of all individual taxpayers. We could determine their tax liabilities by processing information given to the IRS by employers, financial institutions, etc.

Think of the benefits this would bring: By 1990, taxpayers could be spared 97 million hours in return preparation and untold amounts in preparer fees. (Today we are the only country in the world where more than 40 percent of the people pay someone else to do their tax returns.) We would save reams of paper, eliminate much record-keeping, and add millions of smiles to Americans' faces.

What's the alternative? Continued reliance on a patchwork tax code built around tax breaks for special purposes and special interests. But we simply cannot rely on tax breaks to drive our economy, to prop up our businesses or to be the deciding factor for personal investment decisions. If tax breaks are going to make the critical difference between whether one industry makes it or does not make it in the marketplace, then something is very wrong with the tax system and undoubtedly with that industry.

Whatever happened to the free-enterprise system? Since when does it require tax subsidies to make each industry function properly? Or must everyone get some sort of tax break? In that case we have chaos. Perhaps we should reserve tax breaks only for those with the more successful lobbyists. That sounds like the present system.

Today we are preoccupied with adjusting personal and corporate lives to fit the tax code. How much tax you pay is not governed any longer by how much money you earn. It reminds me somewhat of a family where one child is clearly the favorite. The child learns early on to expect special treatment, to know that whatever mistakes he or she makes, his or her interests will be protected. Healthy family relationships become impossible, and the reaction over time from less-favored children is deep and abiding resentment.

We have that resentment today. We also have strong public support for fundamental tax reform, as reflected in several recent opinion polls.

Perhaps it seems unusual that the commissioner of Internal Revenue is becoming an advocate for the American taxpayer. Think about that for a moment. We in the business of tax administration see the returns of the rich and the poor, the partnerships, the corporations, the families and the single people. We have seen it all. In the

final analysis I am not sure there is any group of people more sensitive to the need for basic change than tax administrators.

Despite protests to the contrary, time is not on our side. The tax system cannot hold on indefinitely while we fumble around with so-called tax reform or, worse yet, continue meaningless debate over details of a system that cries out for reform. Let's work together now for ourselves as well as for future generations of taxpayers. ●

EDUCATION IN AMERICA

HON. STAN LUNDINE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1985

● Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Speaker, I commend our colleague, PAT WILLIAMS, for providing this opportunity to discuss America's commitment to education. Such a discussion has once again taken on special significance in light of the Reagan administration's assault on higher education in his fiscal year 1986 budget proposal.

President Reagan has proposed limiting student loans to students with family incomes of less than \$32,500 a year, imposing a cap of \$4,000 per year on the total Federal aid a student could receive, eliminating national direct student loans, and abolishing supplemental educational opportunity grants. In addition, according to the budget proposal, the administration is planning on proposing the replacement of all student aid except guaranteed student loans with a single grant program to be administered by the States.

Reviewing these proposals, I am reminded of the debate 4 years ago when President Reagan proposed cuts of approximately 25 percent in most major education programs. While much of what the President proposed was rejected, we were unable to reject all of these cuts and funding was reduced for many important education programs.

How ironic to learn 2 years later from the President's National Commission on Excellence in Education that "the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a nation and a people."

The report of the National Commission went on to assert that quality education for all members of the society is essential for maintaining the Nation's competitive edge in international economic markets and succeeding in the so-called information age. A well-educated citizenry, the Commission counsels, is the underpinning of a free and democratic society and important for fulfilling this country's promise that all of its people will have their talents developed to the fullest.

I fully agree with these statements and believe that it is time for the President to reacquaint himself with his Commission's work. Certainly, the deficiencies noted throughout the report have not all been addressed.

At the same time, I recognize that we must address our deficit crisis. However, we must do so in a sensible and fair way. The President's 1986 budget has a projected deficit of \$180 billion, cuts spending for many needed domestic programs, including education, and substantially increases defense expenditures. I believe this is inappropriate. A more equitable distribution of the necessary sacrifices is in order.

For these reasons, I believe that we must oppose the President's efforts to weaken Federal support for student financial assistance. Again this year, the President's proposal is excessive and does not recognize the need to continue our investment in our Nation's human resources. Educational opportunity, which these programs help to provide, is essential if we are to preserve the American dream of a better life for tomorrow's generations and improve our Nation's standing in the world. These goals can only be attained if we continue our commitment to education.●

A SALUTE TO FRANKLIN A. POLK

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a pleasure for me to salute my good friend, Mr. Franklin A. Polk, of Cleveland, OH. On April 12, 1985, Mr. Polk will be honored by the Cleveland Marshall University Law School Alumni Association as its Outstanding Alumnus of the Year. I take this opportunity to join in that salute to Franklin A. Polk.

Mr. Speaker, Franklin Polk is a highly respected attorney in Cleveland. He has practiced law in that city for over 44 years. As a result of the quality of the service he has rendered to his clients and the community, Franklin Polk has been the recipient of numerous citations and awards.

In 1984, Franklin Polk received the American Judicature Society Herbert J. Harley Award for lifetime efforts toward improving the Nation's legal system. In 1983, Mr. Polk was the recipient of the Ohio State Bar Association Medal.

For 12 years, he represented the Cuyahoga County Bar Association in the American Bar House of Delegates. For 35 years, he has served as a delegate to the Ohio State Bar Association House of Delegates.

In the late 1940's, Polk was elected president of the Cuyahoga County Bar Association. For the last 39 years, Franklin Polk has chaired the association's annual Public Servants Merits Awards Luncheon Committee.

Mr. Speaker, Franklin Polk is the founder and past president of the Cleveland Academy of Trial Attorneys. He also is a supporting member of the Association of American Trial Attorneys, the Ohio Academy of Trial Attorneys, and the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers.

Mr. Speaker, Franklin Polk has distinguished himself in the legal community in Cleveland and across America. I am proud to salute him as the recipient of the Outstanding Alumnus Award from the Cleveland Marshall Law School. I ask my colleagues to join with me in this salute to Mr. Franklin A. Polk of Cleveland, OH.●

JAZZ WORLD MOURNS LOSS OF KENNY CLARKE

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call my colleagues' attention to the recent passing of jazz great Kenny "Klook" Clarke, who died January 25, 1985, in his home near Paris where he had been living since 1956. Mr. Clarke, age 71, was the original drummer and a founder of the Modern Jazz Quartet in 1952. During his career, he performed on more than 300 records, playing with great artists as Thelonious Monk, Charlie Parker, Billy Eckstine, Dizzy Gillespie, and Louis Armstrong.

Clarke is considered by many of his peers to be the father of be-bop music. He developed this innovative style of musical expression by breaking with the traditional 4-4 rhythms and moving into a more complex scheme, integrating cymbals, and brush with his drum beat. He introduced this technique at jam sessions in New York City during the early forties.

Among Clarke's most memorable recordings are "One O'Clock Jump," "Stomping at the Savoy," and "Venus de Milo."

Kenny Clarke's contributions to the development of jazz have won him recognition around the world. The entire jazz community is, therefore, deeply saddened by his loss. I intend to do all that I can to make sure that the importance of Clarke's musical legacy is not forgotten. It is a legacy that, indeed, we should always treasure.●

THE THREAT OF NUCLEAR ANNIHILATION

HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. AU COIN. Mr. Speaker, as the 99th session of the U.S. Congress progresses, one issue surpasses all others in its urgency and its importance to all mankind. I am speaking of the threat of nuclear annihilation. While negotiations between our Government and the Soviet Union have begun again, we in the Congress must not lose sight of our goals in arms control.

I recently received a letter from Michael Warren, the city manager in Newberg, OR. Mike's comments are filled with wisdom and put the arms control debate in its proper perspective. I would like to share his letter with my colleagues in the House.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On October 19, 1984, my son, Kristopher, was born. It was also my 36th birthday. I've waited a relatively long time to have my first child because the decision was not an easy one. Unfortunately, parents today must weigh the miracle of life and excitement that can only come with a family against events occurring throughout the world. It is unfortunate and sad that a man and woman must consider world politics before starting a family.

I'm writing you today to tell you the thoughts of one parent and how much your action or lack thereof is affecting the lives of this generation and the next. I am talking about the threat of nuclear war or annihilation. The terms that are being used by various public officials disguise it as something less, but you know it for what it is and that is nothing less than the eliminating of life on this planet.

Keep in mind that the person writing this letter is not an extremist nor do I write congressmen and senators on a regular basis. I'm a person that has just had a child and would like to see him lead a happy and full life. It's a sad statement to make, but I firmly believe that the odds are against Kristopher dying of natural causes. With politics and the world being what it is, there is bound to be some nuclear catastrophe. It could be by accident, through terrorists group actions or even one of the super powers claiming that there was no other alternative. However it is done, people feel it will happen and most likely before the turn of the century.

Each congressman or senator that I have written this letter to will probably agree with most, if not all, of this letter. No one is for nuclear war. But how to prevent it is the question that continues to be discussed. I ask you, for Kristopher's sake, and for all the parents that are apprehensive about their children's lives, to stop discussing this issue and begin eliminating nuclear warheads throughout the world. This will require saying no to Army Generals who "have more experience than you, in these matters" and to the lobbyists and various defense companies that are in this business. However, if you truly represent your constituency you will know that the people of the United States (and the world) would like nothing better than to live in a world

that does not have an annihilation cloud hanging over it.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL WARREN.●

FEDERALLY FUNDED RESEARCH PROGRAMS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, federally funded research programs at U.S. universities demonstrate the versatility and strength inherent in the conduct of basic scientific research in this country. I point to an example of this in my own congressional district through the Department of Physics at University of California in Riverside. I had the pleasure of seeing the physics programs first hand as a Regent's Lecturer for the 1984-85 academic year. I am very familiar with the activities of Prof. A. Kernan and her team studying proton-antiproton interactions at very high energies, Prof. B. Shen and his team studying electron-positron interactions at high energies, and Prof. S. Fung and his team studying the interactions of relativistic heavy-nuclei.

I speak with particular pride about our support of such basic research in the high energy physics and nuclear physics which enabled, for example, Professor Kernan and her team to make important contributions to the experiment at CERN which led to the discovery of the long-sought-after intermediate vector bosons—the W and Z particles. These particles are believed to be the carriers of one of nature's four basic forces, the so-called weak force, which is known to be responsible for, among other things, radioactivity. Moreover, scientists believe that the discovery of these intermediate vector particles become the strongest experimental support so far for the unification of two of these forces, the weak force and the electromagnetic force. Therefore it is believed to be the first and the most crucial step toward validating the so-called grand unification theories, which bind together all of the four basic forces, from the force governing nuclear interactions, to the force responsible for the motions of planets and galaxies.

Federal funding for basic scientific research at the universities has, of course, made all this possible. In the past years, the Reagan administration has supported research for particle accelerators and other nuclear physics facilities. This year, however, the level of funding has declined. Operating funds for high energy physics facilities are scheduled to drop from \$546 million to \$510 million, and as a result utilization of the accelerators will fall

to between 55 and 45 percent of capacity. Similarly, nuclear physics funding is slated to decline. This is particularly alarming if the universities are slated to take the brunt of the cuts.

Mr. Speaker, the backbone of our scientific and technological preeminence is our commitment to basic scientific research conducted by universities. This is no less true of our commitment to high energy physics research. I urge my colleagues to consider this as we examine the Department of Energy's basic research budget.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.●

DR. KENNETH S. CONTE
HONORED

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to call to the attention of the Congress the recognition being extended to Dr. Kenneth S. Conte of Saddle Brook, NJ, for his outstanding community service. On March 3, 1985, Dr. Conte will be the recipient of the "Citizen of the Year" award presented by the Saddle Brook Chapter of UNICO.

Dr. Conte is the son of Mrs. Josephine "Pep" Conte and the late Daniel P. Conte. He and his brother, Dr. Daniel P. Conte have fulfilled the lifelong dream of their father by practicing medicine in their home community of Garfield, NJ, in a building designed by him.

Dr. Conte is a graduate of Villanova University where he received his baccalaureate degree. His medical degree was obtained in 1970 from the University of Health Science, College of Osteopathic Medicine in Kansas City, MO. He is presently board certified in general practice and chief of the medical staff at Saddle Brook General Hospital. Dr. Conte is also the attending physician at the Bergen County jail.

Throughout his many years of civic involvement, Dr. Conte has been active and supportive to many organizations. He is a past examining physician of the Garfield Junior Boilermakers and has long been the organizer of the first free medical clinic for senior citizens for the past 10 years. Dr. Conte is a past member of the Garfield City Council, serving two terms of office, during which time he served in the capacity of deputy mayor, councilman, member of the planning board and member of the board of school estimates.

Dr. Conte is respected by his friends and family as a compassionate and understanding individual. He exemplifies the UNICO motto, "Service Above Self." He is truly deserving of the honor being bestowed upon him.●

A SALUTE TO VIC MCCLELLAND

HON. GENE CHAPPIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. CHAPPIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute today to an outstanding gentleman named Vic McClelland. This March Vic will retire from the California Department of Forestry after 30 years of service. I speak for all northern Californians when I say that Vic's presence will be sorely missed.

For the past 30 years Vic McClelland has dedicated his services as a State forest ranger. Those of us who know Vic are fully aware that he has earned the respect and affection of the entire forest service community through his leadership, dedication, and deep concern for people and the environment we live in.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to honor the work that Vic McClelland has done for the State of California, and join the many others in wishing Vic and his lovely wife, Janet, the very best.●

PATRIOTISM DAY AT MOULTRIE MIDDLE SCHOOL

HON. THOMAS F. HARTNETT

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. HARTNETT. Mr. Speaker, today, February 22, 1985, I was vividly reminded that love of this great country is not dying, nor is it restricted to the older segment of our population.

This morning, in a moving culmination of its celebration of National Patriotism Week, Moultrie Middle School, located in my district, presented one of the most enjoyable programs I have ever attended. In an hour long celebration, these young people praised America in music, song, dance, poetry, and a most impressive display of love and respect for our country.

In my 21 years of public service, I have never been more impressed by any assembly.

The continued greatness of America is guaranteed by the obvious devotion of young people such as those who attend Moultrie Middle School in Mount Pleasant, SC. They are truly America's patriots of today and tomorrow.●

AUTHORIZE USE OF BRIDGE REPLACEMENT FUNDS

HON. BERYL ANTHONY, JR.

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation to authorize the use of bridge replacement funds for ferry replacement, as well as bridge replacement. This is not provided for under current law, and it is basically an oversight which needs to be corrected.

In Arkansas, there are four autoferries still in operation which have not been replaced by bridges or where bridges are not now under construction. These are: First, Moro Bay ferry on the Ouachita River in my district; second, Spring Bank ferry on the Red River in my district; third, Guion ferry on the White River in Representative BILL ALEXANDER's district; fourth, Peel ferry on Bull Shoals Lake in Representative JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT's district.

This legislation would not involve additional outlays above what would otherwise be made available for bridge replacement. It would only give to the States the option to utilize part of their bridge replacement funds to replace ferries.

Passage of the legislation is a high priority of the Arkansas State Highway Commission and would enable more modern transportation services in Arkansas and in other States where ferries now exist.●

TRIBUTE TO MARION MARSHALL

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of the San Fernando Valley's most distinguished senior citizens, Marion Marshall.

She is being honored today by the San Fernando Valley Interfaith Council Aging Services Committee for her dedication to the needs of our community.

Marion has been involved in the education field with special emphasis on gerontology and intergenerational programs both as a professional and as a volunteer. Her most recent honor was accorded by the Western Gerontological Association for her leadership in the education of older adults and professionals in the field of gerontology. She is also a senior member of the WGS board of directors.

I am especially pleased to ask the Members to join the interfaith council in expressing its admiration for

Marion Marshall since I have had the honor of her valuable counsel as both a senior intern in my Washington office and as a member of my senior advisory committee.●

THE BRUNSWICK BLUE DEVILS TRAVEL TO WASHINGTON

HON. DONALD J. PEASE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to the Brunswick Marching Blue Devils. On less than 3 weeks notice, this 200-member organization raised over \$40,000 from a community with less than 25,000 people in order to make their trip to the 50th inaugural possible. While the weather stopped paraders, it did not stop the Marching Blue Devils from marching through the streets of Washington. As the only band to march on Monday morning, they even appeared on national television. On Friday night, they performed on the Elipse behind the White House in concert formation at the inaugural festivities.

Their drive and ambition has led them to a long record of winning achievements in State competitions. The support of parents, administrators, and the spirit of these young people is to be admired.●

KIDNAPING REFORM ACT

HON. BILL LOWERY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Speaker, each year hundreds of thousands of children disappear. Many of these innocent children are kidnaped. Legislation, which I am introducing today will address this growing national epidemic.

While many return home safely, thousands are exposed to serious danger, exploitation, and even death. The criminal and sexual exploitation of children is a growing epidemic confronting families, communities, and the agencies of our criminal justice system.

Mr. Speaker, no one is certain of the exact magnitude of the problem, but the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children estimates that at least 1,500,000 children are missing from their homes each year. Additional estimates of the number of children who are the victims of noncustodial parental kidnaping vary from 25,000 to 500,000. The estimated number of children abducted by unknown individuals ranges from 4,000 to 20,000. Finally, between 20,000 and 50,000 children dis-

appear each year whose cases remain unsolved.

Unbelievably, although the number of kidnapers convicted in U.S. courts increased 57 percent from 1983 to 1984, the percentage of those imprisoned actually decreased from 100 percent to 64 percent. Furthermore, the average sentence in 1984 was only 14 years.

Legislation I am introducing, the Kidnaping Reform Act, addresses this grave and incredible situation by substantially reforming the Federal statutes with respect to the kidnaping of minors.

This measure makes two major changes in Federal criminal kidnaping statutes. First, it requires mandatory minimum 10 year sentences without probation for those adults convicted of kidnaping children that are not related to them or who are not in their legal custody. The convicted kidnaper must serve at least 5 years before being considered for parole.

Second, the bill requires a mandatory life sentence for those who kidnap and seriously abuse the child-victim. According to the measure, if the convicted kidnaper in any way sells the child, sexually abuses the child, uses the child for pornography, intentionally denies the child food or medical care to a life-threatening extent, intentionally harms the child to a life-threatening extent, or causes the child to be subjected to any of these activities by another person, then the bill will require a mandatory life sentence without probation. The convicted kidnaper must serve at least 20 years before any parole can be considered.

Again, any parent, grandparent, brother, sister, aunt, uncle, or anyone having legal custody of the victim will not be affected by these mandatory minimum sentences. If any of these individuals should be convicted of kidnaping in a U.S. court, current law will apply—providing for any sentence of years up to and including life.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is only a small first step toward addressing America's growing epidemic of child abduction. However, I am sure you will agree that it is a necessary first step to restore justice. I am sure my colleagues agree that those who sexually abuse or otherwise harm children should not go free. I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting the Kidnaping Reform Act.●

A SALUTE TO JOHN C. COLSON

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, thank you for providing me with this opportunity to salute Mr. John C. Colson,

the recipient of the "Good Joe of 1985" and the "Cleveland Society Heritage" awards. Mr. Speaker, these awards are the highest honors bestowed upon individuals by the Cleveland Society, Inc. The awards are given for fostering the cultural heritage of Poland and promoting the principles of American citizenship. Mr. Colson will receive his awards at the society's 23d annual banquet on Saturday, March 16, 1985, in Cleveland.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to share some of the details about Mr. Colson's involvement in the community through the years.

A native of Cleveland, John Colson attended both Western Reserve University and the University of Cincinnati. After a 3-year stint in the U.S. Army Air Corps, Mr. Colson returned to Cleveland. Until he retired 4 years ago, John Colson was employed with the McNeil Corp.

In addition to his managerial position with that corporation, Mr. Colson was an active member of the following professional organizations: Cleveland Engineering Society, the American Society of Tool Engineers, the society of Manufacturing Engineers and the American Institute of Management.

Mr. Speaker, John Colson has amassed numerous achievements not only in his association with the McNeil Co. but also through various civic organizations. He has served as the president, vice-president and recording secretary of the Cleveland Society of Poles. Currently, he is the chairman of the membership committee.

Additionally, John Colson has served as the board chairman and trustee of the Marymount School of Practical Nursing.

Mr. Speaker, John Colson has made an indelible mark on not only the Polish community in Cleveland but also on people from all walks of life. For his numerous contributions to civic, religious, and community groups, it is a pleasure to join with the Cleveland Society, Inc., in saluting Mr. John C. Colson. ●

SAVE THE JOB CORPS

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, the unemployment rate among our youth is over 20 percent in every area of the country. Many of these are disadvantaged youth who have specialized employment problems. For the last 20 years the needs of these young adults have been met, in part, through the operation of the Job Corps. As my colleagues are aware, the Job Corps, now a part of the Job Training Partnership Act, provides intensive training for

this "at-risk" population by contracting with private organizations. In many cases youth are housed in residential training centers around the country. At any one time 43,000 youths are served, with many more thousands helped in a year, and hundreds of thousands placed since the program's inception.

These statistics alone, however, do not tell the whole success story of the Job Corps. According to the Department of Labor over 82 percent of those leaving the Corps found jobs in the private sector, were admitted to an educational institution for further study, or successfully entered the armed forces. Other independent studies have shown that in some areas of the country as many as 98 percent of the graduates have found permanent jobs after graduation.

All this has been accomplished with little actual cost to the Government. It has been held, for instance, that \$1.40 is returned to society for every Federal dollar spent in the program. In addition, graduates earn, on the average, 15 percent more per year than those who did not have the advantage of participating in the corps.

With all this in mind, how can we possibly justify the administration's proposed elimination of the program? We are told that the Job Corp will be cut simply because it costs too much per participant. I wonder if anyone in the executive branch has bothered to figure out what it would have cost the Government if the estimated 1.2 million disadvantaged youth who formed the Job Corps over the last 20 years, and are now productive members of society had wound up on our welfare rolls instead. I wonder if the executive branch has been bothered to consider the costs to the Nation's future and to individual morale if these youths were not given the opportunities provided them by the program. I think not.

We who know better, well recognize that you don't get something for nothing in this world. Over the last 20 years the Job Corps has given American youth something and we owe it to them and to ourselves to see that the administration's request for nothing does not stand. I urge my colleagues to talk to corps graduates in their districts, visit ongoing corps centers, and investigate for themselves the true value of the Jobs Corps. I think they will find, as I did, that it's worth more than money can buy. ●

HIGH-TECHNOLOGY GROWTH

HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. AU COIN. Mr. Speaker, High-technology growth has been the road

to recovery in many States still climbing out of the recession. For my State, Oregon, this has been particularly true. The first seedlings planted along the Sunset Highway west of Portland have now thickened to a silicon forest, providing new jobs and payrolls in a State whose traditional industries, timber, agriculture, and fishing, are still on wobbly legs.

Our educational system has now expanded to include a high-tech curriculum. Computer science has become one of the most desirable majors in the State colleges. Courses are so popular that students are often forced to wait a number of terms before they are accepted into the classes they need to fulfill graduation requirements.

I've seen firsthand the positive impact of high-technology growth. This industry provides a wide-open job market for those students educated in math, engineering, and related sciences.

This is one reason why I have jointly introduced the High-Technology Research and Scientific Education Act. Among other things, this bill offers tax credit incentives to corporations for their donations of cash and equipment to colleges and universities. For schools, this means more money and better equipment for basic research and classroom instruction. For the corporations, it means a skilled and educated work force to meet their needs. I can't think of a better situation for either party.

I'm submitting for the RECORD an article by David Broder that appeared in the Washington Post. I hope that my colleagues will keep this success story in mind as they reach a decision on the High-Technology Research and Scientific Education Act.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 24, 1985]

OREGON'S TRAIL: TIMBER TO HIGH TECH

(By David S. Broder)

DALLAS, OR.—Robert L. Praegitzer, a burly, middle-aged manufacturer, is an unlikely symbol of a revolution.

But Praegitzer stands at the leading edge of a movement that is transforming this forest state, reordering its economy and politics in ways that will echo here and nationally for years.

A former sawmill owner who produces electronic circuit boards, he has moved in four years from timber to high tech, heavy industry to light, wood chips to microchips. So has the state.

And what is happening here in Oregon is, in turn, a tiny part of a national upheaval, as dozens of states and communities find their politics shaken by fundamental changes in their economic bases.

Last Friday the Oregon House of Representatives voted to institute a state sales tax. The votes had rejected a sales tax six times before, but the growing high-tech industry badly wanted one. That is only one of dozens of examples around the nation of the dramatic ways in which the changing economy is altering governmental policies and shifting political power.

From the booming Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex, where newly arrived young Republicans are unseating established Democratic officeholders, to the small college towns of once safely Republican Vermont, where a new Democratic Party is taking root, the forces of change are visible.

They can be seen at the plant Praegitzer has built on the outskirts of this tiny Willamette Valley town.

Praegitzer, 53, started working in a sawmill at 14 and had his own portable mill by 21. But in the late 1970s, with inflation leading to "crazy bidding" for timber rights and soaring interest rates crippling the construction market, Praegitzer got out of the business.

In 1981, two years after he closed his mill, he and a California partner opened a plant here to manufacture electronic circuit boards. He now employs 105 people—almost as many as he had working for him at the height of his lumber operations. Not one is a carry-over.

The change in Praegitzer's business is directly related to the events Friday in nearby Salem, where the state house passed a bill to give Oregon a 5 percent sales tax as part of a massive restructuring of the revenue system designed to attract new jobs and industry. The sales tax, which has been rejected six times in the past by the voters, passed the Democratic-controlled house 39 to 21, with the endorsement of Republican Gov. Victor G. Atiyeh, who in the past had been as adamantly opposed to it as most Democrats were.

A key to its passage was pressure from the high-tech industry, which wanted relief from high income tax rates and sought a more stable source of school financing than the property tax provides.

It is another sign of the new era in Oregon. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, this state was riding an economic boom. Population jumped by one-sixth between 1965 and 1975. Gov. Tom McCall (R), in office during most of that decade, epitomized Oregon's efforts to slow its growth. McCall went on national television to say, "Come visit, but for God's sake, don't stay."

But even then, technological advances in the timber industry and the shift of its operations to the Southeast were reducing employment in the forests and mills. The severe economic cycles that climaxed in the 1981-82 recession knocked out any complacency in Oregon. Between 1979 and 1982, 26,000 lumber and wood-products jobs were lost. In 1982 and 1983, Oregon's population fell 65,000.

That trend turned around in 1984, but the comeback in lumbering has been spotty. A study in mid-1984 found that fewer than half the lumber and wood-products jobs lost during the recession had been restored. Praegitzer says that "a lot of the woods and mill jobs we've lost, we'll never get back."

Fortunately for Oregon, the decline in the lumber industry has coincided with the rise of a high-tech industry, centered largely in Washington County, just outside Portland, where in 1946 Howard Vollum and Jack Murdock started a garage operation that has grown into Tektronix, an electronics giant employing 15,000 in Oregon.

Tektronix has spawned dozens of offshoots, run by former "Tekkies," and these firms have filled the flanks of the Sunset Highway and the "Silicon Forest" and are spreading down the I-5 corridor running south to Eugene. Overall employment in the industry is estimated at 40,000 jobs (compared to 63,000 in lumber and wood-pro-

ducts). The Oregon Employment Division has estimated that three major segments of high-tech electronics will add more than 24,000 jobs in the 1980s. Some consider that estimate modest.

There are concerns that the state may be split into two sectors, one expanding and the other declining. "The unemployment rate in the Portland area's three counties is 7.5 percent and stabilizing," Julie Tripp of the Portland Oregonian wrote. "The rate in Oregon's other economy is 4 points higher, and in many counties, climbing." In some lumber-dependent areas, year-end unemployment topped 20 percent.

A parallel concern is that the shifting economic base may force many people from high-wage to low-wage jobs. A mid-1984 legislative report warned that "the declining numbers of 'family wage' jobs" constitute "a threat to Oregon's economic health." It said "60,000 of the 75,000 jobs Oregon lost to the recession were in industries paying an average wage of more than \$10 an hour . . . [But] Oregon's recovery has been fueled primarily by growth in services and retailing industries with average wages between \$5 and \$6.50."

There is debate about how serious these economic threats are. Praegitzer, for example, says he starts his circuit-board employees at \$3.50 an hour "but within a couple years, they're making \$15,000 a year. My sawmill people made more an hour, but not in a year, because these people are working regular."

As for the "two economies" fear, such high-tech executives as C. Norman Winningstad, president of Floating Point Systems, a Tektronix spinoff, say they think that in time the high-tech industry will spread into more of the state.

Part of Oregon's high-tech growth comes from people and companies moving out of California's high-priced, densely packed Silicon Valley. Both Winningstad and Thomas H. Bruggere, president of four-year-old Mentor Graphics, are Californians who worked for Tek before starting their own firms. Both have emerged as spokesmen for the high-tech industry in reshaping Oregon's economic policy toward expanding the electronic job pool.

The impact can be seen clearly in the related areas of taxation and education policy. High-tech lives off education facilities; Stanford University's engineering school virtually spawned Silicon Valley. Tek's birthplace in Washington County was in that sense an anomaly, for there was no first-class university nearby. But the industry is forcing the state to fill the vacuum. Although Oregon State University in Corvallis, 80 miles south of the main high-tech center, traditionally has been the locus of engineering studies, Portland State has been adding courses. The high-tech firms have organized a privately financed graduate center in computer sciences to allow a handful of their people to work for advanced degrees.

This year Portland Community College President John Anthony took the lead in creating a "higher-education shopping center" on his Washington County campus—where 13 public and private colleges are offering regular courses in business, computer sciences, technology and education. Started five months ago, it has some 420 students in about 20 undergraduate and graduate courses.

Anthony said high-tech industry enthusiasts envision it developing into a major education center, offering doctoral degrees and sponsoring research.

Meanwhile, the more pressing concern of maintaining and improving the quality of basic education in the state puts the high-tech people into the middle of the legislature's tax fight. They got their feet wet last summer, in a special session that repealed the state's unitary tax—a tax on worldwide operations of multinational companies. The reward for Oregon from that action was a rush of Japanese investment—some designed to send a message to neighboring California, which has a unitary tax.

Many high-tech leaders were also active in the fight that narrowly defeated a Proposition 13-type property tax rollback on the ballot in November. Bruggere of Mentor Graphics flew around the state warning that "if we cut the property tax, we will decimate education, and education is essential for expanding our business." Winningstad says, "When we are recruiting people, the best thing we can tell them is that we have excellent schools from kindergarten through the 12th grade and their kids won't have to knife-fight their way through the halls."

This year, the Oregon council of the American Electronic Association, representing 88 major high-tech firms, played a lead role in lobbying for Friday's house passage of a sales tax. Much of the revenue gained from the 5 percent tax would be devoted to property tax abatement, thus providing a more stable financial base for public schools. Another chunk would go toward reducing the state income tax, one of the stiffest in the nation. And that, too, Bruggere and Winningstad said, would attract high-tech entrepreneurs.

The sales tax vote displayed not just the growing influence of the high-tech industry but the relative power loss of the timber industry and organized labor. Timber officials helped block a sales tax from getting to a referendum vote in 1983. This year, seeing the way the cards were stacked, they agreed to back it in return for a reduction in their severance tax.

Organized labor faced a tougher situation: Irv Fletcher, president of the Oregon AFL-CIO, said his organization has "opposed the sales tax since 1933" as being regressive. But labor is reeling in the state, its membership down almost one-third in the past five years, as unionized lumber and construction jobs have been replaced by nonunion high-tech manufacturing and service jobs.

While complaining that "all these legislators want to do is give tax breaks to non-union employers," Fletcher fought with his executive board and gained permission to negotiate on the terms of the sales tax proposal. If the sales tax passes the state senate, there will be a public referendum on it. The labor federation plans to hold a convention to decide its final stand on the issue if it reaches the referendum stage.

But there is no question that the strong trend in the Democratic Party is to accommodate the perceived needs of the fastest-growing industry, high-tech. As Winningstad, an active Democrat, said, "The Democratic Party here has traditionally been dominated by labor; it was the major source of funds. But the old-line Democratic politicians who represent the labor position have lost their voice in the state legislature."

The high-tech industry's political action committee gave its biggest contribution in 1984 to Vera Katza, a Portland legislator who won a 101-ballot battle to become speaker of the house and who stacked the house Ways and Means Committee to assure passage of the sales tax.

The industry was also persuasive, Salem observers say, in getting Gov. Atiyeh to drop his long opposition to the sales tax and become a major proponent.

On other issues, however, high-tech has reinforced progressive and even liberal tendencies that came to dominate Oregon politics in the McCall era. Unlike the timber industry, high-tech prizes the state's tough environmental and land-use controls. Easy access to unpolluted beaches and unscarred ski slopes is a major lure to high-tech executives and workers.

While the timber companies have often sought protection against foreign competition and, in many cases, been slow to adapt to export markets, the high-tech people are a major force behind the state's increasing interest in developing trade, particularly with Japan and China.

They also support the flurry of local economic-development plans spurred by last year's passage of a state lottery, which will funnel an estimated \$40 million a year into attracting new jobs.

Some cities, like McMinnville, which saw the lumber mills pull out as long ago as the 1950s, are ahead of the game in economic development, with a Hewlett-Packard plant in town and diverse small industries in two industrial parks. But most are only now getting into a serious search for replacement of the diminishing lumber jobs.

Praegitzer, who has made the transition, said, "I don't see any reason the state can't make this kind of shift. I know a lot of high-tech people in California who want to come here to get out of the rat race. The ones that move here really like it. They even like the rain."●

SARAH CANGIALOSI NAMED "WOMAN OF THE YEAR"

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1985

● Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to call to the attention of the Congress the recognition being extended to Ms. Sarah Cangialosi for her outstanding community service. On March 2, 1985, Sarah Cangialosi will be the recipient of the "Woman of the Year" award presented by the Italian-American Forum of Lodi, New Jersey.

Sarah Cangialosi is a dedicated and hard-working member of the Italian-American Forum of Lodi. Although she is only 20 years old, Sarah has become a respected member of the community and one whom other young people can look to for guidance.

Sarah's hard work and fundraising activities have enabled the Italian-American Forum of Lodi to prosper and grow. Fortunately, Sarah's fundraising activity does not end there. She recently raised \$2,000 for the needy people of Ethiopia.

Sarah Cangialosi is respected by her friends and family as a compassionate and understanding individual. She is truly deserving of the honor being bestowed upon her and I am proud to join her friends and family in recognizing her many accomplishments.●

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, February 28, 1985, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 1

9:00 a.m.

Armed Services

To resume hearings on the status of the unified commands.

SR-222

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings in conjunction with the national ocean policy study on the Pacific Salmon Treaty implementing legislation.

SD-562

Energy and Natural Resources

To continue oversight hearings to review those programs which fall within the jurisdiction of the committee as contained in the President's proposed budget for fiscal year 1986, focusing on the Forest Service (Department of Agriculture), U.S. Synthetic Fuels Corporation, and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Department of Energy).

SD-366

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Mine Safety and Health Administration, and Departmental Management, all of the Department of Labor, and the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

SD-116

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to continue markup of S. 51, to extend and amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (Superfund) (Public Law 96-510).

SD-406

2:00 p.m.

Armed Services

Strategic and Theater Nuclear Forces Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Defense, focusing on strategic defense initiatives.

SR-222

MARCH 4

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To continue oversight hearings to review those programs which fall within the jurisdiction of the committee as contained in the President's proposed budget for fiscal year 1986, focusing on the Department of Energy.

SD-366

MARCH 5

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Agriculture.

SD-124

*Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Office of Secretary of Health and Human Services.

SD-116

*Judiciary

Immigration and Refugee Policy Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and to review those programs administered by the INS.

SD-226

Select on Intelligence

To resume closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the intelligence community.

SH-219

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Defense Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Army.

SD-192

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, and the Panama Canal Commission.

SD-138

10:30 a.m.

Finance

Business meeting, to review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1986 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction in preparation for making its recommendations to the Committee on the Budget.

SD-215

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior.

SD-138

Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for energy and water development programs, focusing on the Tennessee Valley Authority.

SD-192

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on the nominations of Carol G. Dawson, of Virginia, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, and Mary L. Azcuenaga, of the District of Columbia, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner.

SR-253

Select on Intelligence
To continue closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the intelligence community.

SR-219

MARCH 6

9:00 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs
Business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the Veterans' Administration.

SR-418

Office of Technology Assessment
To hold a general business meeting.

H-227, Capitol

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Health and Human Services, including the Health Resources and Services Administration, and the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health.

SD-116

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary and related agencies.

S-146, Capitol

Foreign Relations
To resume hearings to review U.S. policy in a global economy.

SD-419

10:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on the nomination of Edward J. Philbin, of California, to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner.

SR-253

Judiciary
To resume hearings on S. 172, to provide a cause of action to cities to prevent professional football teams from abandoning them for more profitable locations, and to provide limited antitrust immunity to joint action of those

teams engaged in professional football, and S. 298, to clarify congressional intent regarding the application of antitrust laws to certain types of major sports leagues practices and decisions.

SD-226

Select on Intelligence

To continue closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the intelligence community.

SH-219

11:00 a.m.

Select on Indian Affairs.

To hold hearings on S. 277, authorizing funds through fiscal year 1989 for Indian health care programs.

SD-106

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review proposed regulations that require individuals to maintain certain records for business vehicles if they want to deduct the business expenses associated with the use of a vehicle from their taxes.

SD-138

Judiciary
To hold hearings on pending nominations.

SD-226

MARCH 7

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of State, focusing on foreign assistance programs.

SD-138

Small Business
To resume hearings on S. 408, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1986, 1987, and 1988 for the Small Business Administration.

SR-428A

10:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings on proposals to revise American farm policy.

SD-G50

Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Food and Nutrition Service, and the Human Nutrition Information Service, Department of Agriculture.

SD-124

Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Navy.

SD-628

Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for energy and water development programs, focusing on the Department of Energy.

SD-192

Labor and Human Resources
Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review a recent report on international narcotics.

SD-430

2:00 p.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue hearings on proposals to revise American farm policy.

SD-G50

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the strategic petroleum reserve, and the Office of Emergency Preparedness.

SD-138

Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the National Transportation Safety Board, and the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, Department of Transportation.

SD-192

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Federal Labor Relations Authority, Administrative Conference of the United States, Advisory Committee on Federal Pay, U.S. Tax Court, and the Committee for Purchase from the Blind.

SD-116

MARCH 8

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

SR-253

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works
To resume hearings on those programs which fall within the jurisdiction of the committee as contained in the President's budget requests for fiscal year 1986, focusing on requests for the Army Corps of Engineers.

SD-406

Judiciary
To hold hearings on proposed interstate compacts allowing for the regional disposal of low-level radioactive waste.

SD-226

MARCH 12

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary
Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the farm credit crisis.

SD-226

Veterans' Affairs
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review the legislative priorities of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

345 Cannon Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Agricultural Research Service, Cooperative State Research Service, Extension

Service, and the National Agricultural Library, Department of Agriculture.

SD-124

Appropriations

Foreign Operations Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the United Nations, focusing on voluntary contributions to international organizations and programs.

SD-192

10:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

SD-138

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Energy and Water Development Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for energy and water development programs, focusing on solar and renewable and energy research.

SD-192

MARCH 13

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the National Bureau of Standards.

SR-253

Judiciary

Constitution Subcommittee

To hold hearings on certain issues promoting affirmative integration.

SD-226

10:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Business, Trade, and Tourism Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 374 and S. 193, bills authorizing funds for the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration, Department of Commerce.

SD-G50

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-406

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Foreign Operations Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of State, focusing on international security assistance programs.

S-126, Capitol

MARCH 14

9:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and to hold oversight hearings on the Department of Transportation's Office of Commercial Space Transportation.

SR-253

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the

Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, Japan-United States Friendship Commission, Federal Trade Commission, and the Civil Rights Commission.

S-146, Capitol

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, and the Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture.

SD-124

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

SD-192

Select on Intelligence

To resume closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the intelligence community.

SH-219

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Foreign Operations Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of State, focusing on international narcotics control, migration and refugee assistance, and antiterrorism programs.

S-126, Capitol

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Smithsonian Institution.

SD-138

Appropriations

Energy and Water Development Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for energy and water development programs, focusing on nuclear fission, commercial waste management, and uranium enrichment.

SD-192

Appropriations

Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of the Treasury.

SD-116

Select on Intelligence

To continue closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the intelligence community.

SH-219

MARCH 19

9:00 a.m.

Select on Intelligence

To resume closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the intelligence community.

SH-219

9:30 a.m.

*Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Na-

tional Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services.

SD-116

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Aviation Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the aviation computer reservation system.

SR-253

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Earthquake Hazard Reduction Act (P.L. 98-241).

SD-G50

Labor and Human Resources

Labor Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on proposed asbestos claims facilities.

SD-430

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Agricultural Marketing Service, and the Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture.

SD-124

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Foreign Operations Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Peace Corps, the Inter-American Foundation, and the African Development Foundation.

S-126, Capitol

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the land and water conservation fund.

SD-138

Appropriations

Energy and Water Development Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

SD-192

Appropriations

Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Federal Elections Commission, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Merit Systems Protection Board, Office of Special Counsel, and the National Archives and Records Service.

SD-116

MARCH 20

9:00 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review the legislative priorities of AMVETS, World War I Veterans, Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A., and Atomic Veterans.

334 Cannon Building

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

*Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services.

SD-116

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Commerce, and the International Trade Commission.

S-146, Capitol

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the American Battle Monuments Commission, Army cemetery expenses, Office of Consumer Affairs (Department of Commerce), and the Consumer Information Center.

SD-124

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, and the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (AMTRAK).

SD-138

Governmental Affairs

Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations

To hold hearings on media efforts to deglamorize drug abuse.

SD-342

Select on Intelligence

To continue closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the intelligence community.

SH-219

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Foreign Operations Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

S-126, Capitol

Select on Intelligence

To continue closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the intelligence community.

SH-219

MARCH 21

9:30 a.m.

*Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services.

SR-428A

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Consumer Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 100, to provide for a uniform product liability law.

SR-253

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, National Credit Union Administration, Office of Revenue Sharing and the New York City loan program (Department of the Treasury), Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and the National Institute of Building Sciences.

SD-192

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, and the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board.

SD-138

Appropriations

Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Office of Personnel Management.

SD-116

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Merchant Marine Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the maritime administration, and S. 102, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the maritime construction differential subsidy.

SD-628

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Foreign Operations Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of the Treasury, focusing on multilateral development banks.

SD-192

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for energy conservation programs.

SD-138

Appropriations

Energy and Water Development Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for energy and water development programs, focusing on atomic energy defense activities.

SD-116

MARCH 25

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Employment and Productivity Subcommittee

To hold hearings on a proposal to reform the current system of Federal funding for graduate medical education.

SD-430

MARCH 26

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

*Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the De-

partment of Health and Human Services, including the Centers for Disease Control, Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration, Office of the Inspector General, and Office for Civil Rights.

SD-116

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Stevenson/Wylder Technology Innovation Act (P.L. 96-480).

SR-253

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Farmers Home Administration, Department of Agriculture, and the Farm Credit Administration.

SD-124

Appropriations

Foreign Operations Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Agency for International Development.

S-126, Capitol

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Foreign Operations Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Agency for International Development.

S-126, Capitol

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Geological Survey, Department of the Interior.

SD-138

Appropriations

Energy and Water Development Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for energy and water development programs, focusing on the Power Marketing Administration.

SD-192

Appropriations

Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Office of the Secretary, Financial Management Service, Bureau of the Public Debt, U.S. Mint, U.S. Savings Bonds Division, all of the Department of Treasury, and the U.S. Postal Service.

SD-116

MARCH 27

9:00 a.m.

Select on Intelligence

To resume closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the intelligence community.

SH-219

9:30 a.m.

*Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Health and Human Services, including the Health Care Financing Administration, Social Security Administration, and refugee programs.

SD-116

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Board for International Broadcasting, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the Federal Communications Commission.

S-146, Capitol

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Foreign Operations Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for foreign assistance programs.

S-126, Capitol

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Selective System, Consumer Product Safety Commission, Office of Science and Technology Policy, and the Council on Environmental Quality.

SD-124

MARCH 28

9:30 a.m.

*Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Health and Human Services, including Human Development Services, Office of Community Services, Departmental Management (salaries and expenses), and Policy Research.

SD-116

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

SR-253

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Veterans Administration, and the National Science Foundation.

S-126, Capitol

Appropriations

Energy and Water Development Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for energy and water development programs.

SD-192

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation Commission, and the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior.

SD-138

Appropriations

Energy and Water Development Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for energy and water development programs.

SD-192

Appropriations

Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Executive Office of the President, and the Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury.

SD-116

APRIL 1

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Energy and Water Development Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for energy and water development programs.

SD-192

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Energy and Water Development Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for energy and water development programs.

SD-192

APRIL 2

9:30 a.m.

*Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Office of the Secretary of Education, Departmental Management (salaries and expenses), Office of Civil Rights, Office of Inspector General, National Institute of Education, and Bilingual Education, all of the Department of Education.

SD-116

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Commodity Credit Corporation, Foreign Agricultural Service, Office of International Cooperation and Development, Food for Peace Program (P.L. 480), Soil Conservation Service, and the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture.

SD-124

Appropriations

Energy and Water Development Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986

for energy and water development programs.

SD-192

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

SD-138

Appropriations

Energy and Water Development Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for energy and water development programs.

SD-192

APRIL 3

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

*Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Education, including vocational and adult education, education for the handicapped, rehabilitation services and handicapped research, special institutions (including Howard University), and education statistics.

SD-116

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of State, and the U.S. Information Agency.

S-146, Capitol

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Energy and Water Development Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for energy and water development programs.

SD-192

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation.

SD-138

Appropriations

Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the U.S. Secret Service, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, and the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, all of the Department of the Treasury.

SD-124

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Energy and Water Development Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for energy and water development programs.

SD-192

APRIL 4

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, the Marine Mammal Commission, and the Small Business Administration.

S-146, Capitol

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To resume hearings in closed session on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

SR-253

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

SD-124

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

SD-192

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for Conrail, U.S. Railway Association, and the Office of the Secretary of Transportation.

SD-138

10:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To continue hearings in open session on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

SR-253

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior.

SD-138

APRIL 16

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, Department of Transportation.

SD-138

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior.

SD-138

APRIL 17

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Justice, and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

S-146, Capitol

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the U.S. Customs Service, Department of the Treasury.

SD-124

APRIL 18

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation.

SD-138

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the National Endowment for the Arts.

SD-138

APRIL 23

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Education, including elementary and secondary education, education block grants, and impact aid.

SD-116

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

SD-138

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of the Treasury, U.S. Postal Service, and General Government programs.

SD-138

APRIL 24

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Education, including student financial assistance, guaranteed student loans, higher and continuing education, higher education facilities loans and insurance, educational research and training, and libraries.

SD-116

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, the Legal Services Corporation, and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

S-146, Capitol

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and the Environmental Protection Agency.

SD-124

APRIL 25

9:30 a.m.

*Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for ACTION (domestic programs), Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and National Council on the Handicapped.

SD-116

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Office of Management and Budget, including the Office of Federal Procurement Policy.

SD-138

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Office of Indian Education, and the Institute of Museum Services.

SD-138

APRIL 30

9:30 a.m.

*Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Soldiers' and Airmen's Home, Prospective Payment Commission, Railroad Retirement Board, National Mediation Board, OSHA Review Commission,

February 27, 1985

and the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

SD-116

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Office of the Secretary and the Office of the Solicitor, Department of the Interior.

SD-138

MAY 1

9:30 a.m.

*Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and certain related agencies.

SD-116

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Supreme Court of the United States, and the U.S. District Courts.

S-146, Capitol

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and certain independent agencies.

SD-124

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the General Services Administration.

SD-138

MAY 2

9:30 a.m.

*Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and certain related agencies.

SD-116

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

tee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and certain independent agencies.

SD-124

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

tee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for territorial affairs, Department of the Interior.

SD-138

MAY 7

9:30 a.m.

*Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and certain related agencies.

SD-116

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

tee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services.

SD-138

MAY 8

9:30 a.m.

*Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and certain related agencies.

SD-116

MAY 9

9:30 a.m.

*Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the De-

3991

partments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and certain related agencies.

SD-116

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

tee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.

SD-138

MAY 14

9:30 a.m.

*Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and certain related agencies.

SD-116

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

tee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Energy Information Administration, and the Economic Regulatory Administration, Department of Energy.

SD-138

MAY 21

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

tee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Holocaust Memorial Council, Minerals Management Service, Department of the Interior.

SD-138

MAY 23

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

tee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for Naval Petroleum Reserves, and fossil energy.

SD-138